



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOVEMBER MEETING, 1884.

The stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 13th instant. The President being absent from the city, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS occupied the chair.

The Secretary's minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Librarian's list of donations to the Library was presented, and special mention was made of an important collection of pamphlets relating to the Rebellion, which had been given by Mr. Amos A. Lawrence.

Colonel LEE, in behalf of the Committee on English Research,¹ reported that the services rendered by Mr. Henry F. Waters to the cause of historical research,—notably the recent discovery by him in England of the Winthrop map and the Maverick manuscript, two of the most valuable and interesting contributions made in relation to our early colonial history since the incorporation of this Society—well deserve recognition; and the Committee therefore recommend that they be authorized to receive from the treasury of the Society the sum of one hundred dollars a year, for three successive years, as a contribution towards the carrying on of this work.

The recommendation was adopted.

The Treasurer offered the following vote, which was passed:—

Voted, That the sum of six hundred dollars, being the income of the Massachusetts Historical Trust Fund for the year ending Sept. 1, 1884, be and is hereby appropriated toward the publication of a volume of Trumbull Papers, and that the words "Published at the charge of the Massachusetts Historical Trust Fund" be placed on the titlepage of the volume.

Dr. ELLIS then spoke as follows:—

We miss our honored President from his chair to-day, as he is absent on a brief visit to New York. Our regret at the loss

¹ *Ante*, p 249. — EDS.

of his presence, on rare occasions, is relieved only by our well-warranted expectations of receiving on his return some incidental fruits of his observation and experience.

By the usages of this Society the death of Mr. Ellis Ames, which occurred since our last meeting, would not be a subject of special notice by us to-day, as his name had just been withdrawn by him from our roll, on account of his bodily infirmities. But he had been so recently with us — his withdrawal, offered last winter, not having then been admitted by the Council, and allowed only with reluctance when renewed at our last meeting, while the vacancy has not yet been filled — that we cannot part with him without some expression of our esteem and regret. I recall the occasion when at a meeting of this Society Mr. Ames was proposed for membership by Chief Justice Shaw. He was elected Aug. 12, 1852. Very busy as he was with an extensive legal practice in this city and in a wide region round his home in Canton, largely in towns of the Old Colony, he was glad to be present at our meetings, where he was an interested listener when he was not entertaining us with some of his quaintly characteristic communications. He represented in the Society an element which, in its proportion, is needed as essential and becoming here. Dispensing with all graces of rhetoric and literary finish, he had a gift for exact statement and for curt utterance. He was one of those indispensable brethren in an historical and antiquarian fellowship, able and willing to search out a class of facts dry as the old records, without a particle of juice or fragrance, but giving to history a quality like toughness in parchment. As a commissioner for editing and publishing the formidable volumes of the Province Laws, his own single pair of eyes, with the keen instinct behind them, answered the uses of a thousand ordinary orbs of vision. Coming here with some of the pleasing rusticities of his country home in garb and mien and phrase and speech, his individuality brought to us pleasure and profit.

It gratifies this Society from time to time to recognize the more important contributions made to our history by our associates, whether coming through our own publications or through independent channels. The addition which our associate Mr. Parkman has just made to his admirable series of volumes under the general title of "France and England in

North America," is in itself a work which alone might well claim for him the highest tribute for ability, fidelity, comprehensive and diligent research, and a marvellous skill in narrative and descriptive writing. The work, bearing the names of "Montcalm and Wolfe," — the two heroic generals, who both fell on the field where they sustained, in defeat or victory, the glory and empire of France and England on this continent, — is one of high genius and of a unique interest. While the author has given to it the fruitage of forty years of continuous devotion and absorption of time and thought, in exploration by land and water, and in research in documentary archives, with his unequalled skill in woodcraft and in Indian life and lore, he has furnished himself for dealing with this crowning tragedy of his theme with the richest equipment of authentic materials of record. Private cabinets, especially some in France and England, which have heretofore been jealously guarded, have been opened confidentially to him by the noble representatives of prime actors in his history, as a tribute to his own high qualities for an able and impartial dealing with them. Thousands of folios of original official pages, still quick and warm with the burning conflicts and passions which make their tenor, have now for the first time been put to full service by him to clear up, rectify, and present with exact fidelity, some perplexed and critical subjects, till now only tentatively and superficially dealt with. The episode of especial interest in the work relates to the deportation of the so-called French Neutrals from Acadia. We have now offered to us a candid and truthful view of the occasions and processes of that tragic event. The share of Massachusetts in whatever was cruel or inevitably necessary in that incident comes through the engagement in it of our provincial forces auxiliary to the British Regulars, under the command of our Major-General John Winslow. It adds another cloud to the shadows resting on old Acadia, that though Winslow died the year preceding the outbreak of our Revolution, so many of his own nearest of kin, with thousands of our native Loyalists, driven from their homes, were forced to find a refuge in and near the regions whence the Acadians were removed.

I have received for presentation to this Society, through the hands of Miss R. M. Farnsworth, — a cousin of the late Mr.

Ebenezer Thayer, an old Bostonian, long a resident of Brooklyn, N. Y., where he died,—a china plate, enclosed in a richly ornamented frame, which has value as a relic. It comes to us from Mr. Thayer's executors, as directed by his will. The plate is one of a set presented to George and Martha Washington by a French officer whose name is now unknown, though it was not Lafayette. Some papers accompanying the gift would fully authenticate it if any such evidence were needed. Mr. Thayer himself received it from Mrs. Rosalie Eugenia Stuart Webster. It was given to her by the wife of her half-brother, George Washington Parke Custis, an adopted son of General Washington. Mrs. Webster was a daughter of Dr. David Stuart, of Virginia, who married the widow of Mr. Custis, whose children by her were thus half brothers and sisters of the Custis children. The plate shows in a circlet the names of fifteen of our States, including Vermont and Kentucky, richly enwreathed. It must, then, have been manufactured after June 1, 1792, when Kentucky was admitted into the Union. As Washington was elected for his second term as President in the autumn of that year, the present to him may have been made in recognition of his new honor. The enwreathed names of the States surround with a halo an illuminated monogram,—a large W and a small M,—surmounted by the legend, *Decus et Tutamen ab Illo*. The richness of the mounting shows the value attached to the relic, and is in keeping with its own beauty.

As the plate comes to our hands, an accident which had some time previously befallen it gives it a symbolical character. A fracture running from the top to the bottom divides the circle into two unequal parts, strangely corresponding, as it severs the names of the States, with the line marked between those which seceded and those which held to the Union. The line of fracture divides the name of Maryland nearly equally. This, too, is significant. Happily the fracture is firmly closed with cement and rivets.

Mrs. Webster has written, in a note accompanying this gift to us, that the only child of her brother "was robbed of Arlington by the President and Congress of the United States." But as this relic was not included among the stolen goods, we can have no scruple in gratefully receiving it with due acknowledgments.

Mr. Lord was appointed to prepare a Memoir of the late Mr. Williams Latham, which had been previously assigned to Mr. Ellis Ames, who left one in an unfinished state.

Communications from the Third Section having been called for, Mr. R. C. WINTHROP, Jr., said : —

I will take the opportunity to communicate, by title only, a series of letters written between 1653 and 1683 by members of the family of Sylvester. Gentlemen who read the "Daily Advertiser" may remember a long account of an interesting celebration on Shelter Island, in Long Island Sound, on the 21st of July last, commemorative of Nathaniel Sylvester, an English merchant who subsequently became a Quaker, and who was one of the early proprietors of Shelter Island, a portion of which is still in possession of descendants of his in the female line. On this occasion a monument was dedicated to him, and addresses were delivered by Professor Horsford, of Cambridge, and others. The President of this Society, remembering that he had seen Sylvester letters in the unexplored portion of the Winthrop Papers, recently suggested to me to examine them. I found nine letters from Nathaniel Sylvester aforesaid, one from his brother, Constant Sylvester, four from his brother Giles Sylvester, one from his brother Joshua Sylvester, a fragment of a letter from Grizzell Sylvester, wife of Nathaniel, and eleven letters from her son Giles Sylvester the younger; also a memorandum of certain clauses in the patent for Shelter Island, together with a scrap of paper indorsed "Capt. Sylvester's Ague," which gives a harrowing account of the periodic recurrence of what the writer terms "a most exceeding great payn in my stomach," which, I trust, has not proved hereditary.

These letters possess a considerable degree of personal interest, but are of little public importance, and I do not intend to read any of them to the Society. I am having them copied, however, and may select a few extracts for the next volume of Proceedings, if the Council see fit. The only passage I have thus far marked is illustrative of the early development in New England of a taste for genealogical and heraldic research. Under date of Shelter Island, Aug. 19, 1677, Giles Sylvester, Jr., writes Wait Winthrop : —

"The occasion of my giving you the trouble of this is that, having received two letters from Capt. Salisbury earnestly entreating me to send him a draught of a scutcheon borne by the name of Salisbury, which he chanced to have the sight of in Gwillim whilst I had the perusal of it, but, having returned the book to you, I cannot pleasure him, unless you will please to favor me with a copy of the same, mentioning its colours, by this bearer who returns shortly. Capt. Salisbury wants it to compare with his own lately sent to him from his sister in England. If there be any crest mentioned, please insert it."

As I am about to furnish the descendants of Nathaniel Sylvester with a file of family papers hitherto unknown, I feel at liberty to offer a gentle criticism upon the inscription they have seen fit to place on his monument. It is a long and intricate one, commemorating not merely Nathaniel himself and his predecessors and successors at Shelter Island, but also the sufferings of certain Quakers, male and female, who took refuge there, and some of whose descendants, represented by Professors Peirce and Dyer, of Harvard College, took an active part in the celebration. After a recital of the names of these Quakers, who are variously described on the monument as having been "despoiled, imprisoned, starved, whipped, banished, much-scourged, mutilated, branded, and maimed," the inscription proceeds: "The Puritan in his pride, overcome by the faith of the Quaker, gave Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill to History." I may be very obtuse, but I have read this sentence over and over again without being able to grasp its meaning. I am not familiar with any evidence that the pride of the Puritan ever was overcome by the faith of the Quaker; nor am I able to understand how this alleged triumph of Quaker faith could have had any effect upon the battles of the Revolution. I do not wish to seem to disparage Quakers, — on the contrary, I have some personal reasons for thinking well of them, — but, so far as our Revolutionary struggle is concerned, I think we can fairly congratulate ourselves that the men who stood behind the redoubt on Bunker Hill and the bridge at Concord were not believers in the doctrine of non-resistance.

Before I sit down, I should like to add a few words of criticism upon another inscription on a still more recently erected monument to a more distinguished man of about the same period. The inscription on the base of John Harvard's

statue is as short as that on Nathaniel Sylvester's monument is long; but, like the latter, it presents an obscurity to my mind. It runs, "John Harvard — Founder — 1638." Now this date 1638 may have been intended to signify merely that John Harvard died in that year, and if the inscription had been, "John Harvard — Founder — died 1638," I should have had nothing to say; but it seems to me that the successive generations of students, whose eyes will rest with admiration upon this most successful work of art, must inevitably obtain the impression that the date 1638, following immediately upon the word "Founder," denotes the natal year of their Alma Mater. It is within my knowledge that strangers have already so interpreted it, and have been puzzled to reconcile the date 1638 with the distinct statement in the official catalogues of the University that this natal year was 1636. The accomplished man who presides over the destinies of the College has made sweeping changes there during his term of office, and is understood to contemplate many more. This inscription could hardly have failed to be submitted to him, — was, for aught I know, written by him, — and it may perhaps be an indication that he has made up his mind that the dates assigned by his predecessors are as faulty as was their system of instruction, and has decreed that the titlepage of the forthcoming Quinquennial Catalogue, due next summer, shall take a new departure. Whether this be so or not, my contention is that this time-honored natal year 1636, recognized, as it has been, not merely in University Catalogues, but by successive historians of the College, by successive historians of New England, and in all encyclopædias and works of reference, so far as I am familiar with them, is in danger of being overshadowed and cast into comparative oblivion by the new date, 1638, which now greets us on the Delta. Somebody may remind me that the seal of the College, as emblazoned on the north side of the pedestal of this same statue, also bears date 1638; but my answer to this is that the College has had a number of seals, the earliest of which bore no date whatever; and this present one, dated 1638, would appear to be of recent invention, as I find no mention of it in President Quincy's History of the University. I do not wish to take up time by citing authorities, but I should like to call attention to a single sentence in Palfrey's "History of New

England.”¹ After giving the date of the institution of the College by the General Court of Massachusetts as Oct. 28, 1636, the author proceeds to indorse a passage in a speech of Edward Everett, delivered at that famous commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the College, in 1836, which some gentlemen present may remember. Dr. Palfrey's words are, “That Massachusetts Assembly over which Henry Vane presided has been said to be the first body by which the people, by their representatives, ever gave their own money to found a place of education.” I am not, Sir, I confess, as enthusiastic an admirer of Sir Harry Vane as some members of this Society probably are; but it has always seemed to me one of the most interesting features of Vane's brief career in this country, that during the single year of his Governorship, and under his auspices, the College at Cambridge should have been instituted. I think we should be slow to permit this feather to be plucked from the cap of a man who went to the scaffold in the cause of civil and religious liberty. The last person to desire it would, I believe, have been John Harvard. We must each form our own conception of the character of a young man of whom we know so little and to whom we owe so much; but, for my own part, I like to picture Harvard as one who was not merely a lover of learning, but a lover of justice,—as one who, had he been present in the spirit, as perhaps he was, a few weeks ago, in Sanders Theatre, and had he possessed any means of intelligible manifestation, would have made haste, at the conclusion of the exercises, to do two things: First, to express his acknowledgments to all concerned in erecting the memorial,—to the eloquent and learned orator of the day (Dr. Ellis) in particular; and, second, to say to the assembled audience: “I am proud and happy that you consider me your founder,—and so I suppose I was, more than any one man,—but I am sorry the inscription on my statue should imply the slightest want of recognition of the fact that long before my death, before I had ever set foot on these shores, the magistrates of the Massachusetts Colony had taken formal steps to establish a seat of learning, to which they subsequently assigned my name.”²

¹ Vol. i. p. 548.

² It is beyond question that in 1636 the General Court not only determined to establish a college, but actually made an appropriation of money towards it.

Mr. QUINCY then addressed the Society substantially in these words: —

I have brought with me this little book, which I present to the Society. Its interest is not very great, but it will give me the opportunity of saying some words which seem to be due to the memory of a remarkable man. These few pages of manuscript preserve an imperfect record of certain conversations with Alexandre Vattemare, or, to speak more correctly, of his part in those conversations. They were copied by a Boston lady — the late Mrs. B. D. Greene — from journals which she was about to destroy. It must be confessed that such traces of the nimble-minded Frenchman as are here to be found are somewhat meagre and disappointing. I had the privilege of knowing Mr. Vattemare when he was in this country, and later in my life I visited him at his house in Paris. And in that delightful home-circle — in which four generations were represented — I well remember the charm of his conversation. To a varied experience he added a despotic command over the accessories of speech. His countenance, which in repose was as sad as any human face I ever saw,

It is likewise unquestionable that in 1637 they designated a place at which the college should be located. It was to this institution, which he recognized as having been already created, that John Harvard bequeathed the half of his estate. These facts are plainly stated in the Harvard University Catalogue of the present year, on page 10: —

“HARVARD COLLEGE was founded in 1636, by a vote passed at an adjourned meeting (October 28, Old Style) of the General Court of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay which convened on September 8th of that year. The language of the vote was as follows: —

“‘The Court agree to give Four Hundred Pounds towards a *School or College*, whereof Two Hundred Pounds shall be paid the next year, and Two Hundred Pounds when the work is finished, and the next Court to appoint where and what building.’

“The ensuing year (1637) the General Court appointed twelve of the most eminent men of the colony (among whom were John Cotton and John Winthrop) ‘to take order for a college at Newtown.’ The name, ‘Newtown,’ was soon afterwards changed by the General Court to *Cambridge*, in recognition of the English University where many of the colonists had been educated.

“The following year (1638) John Harvard, a non-conforming clergyman of England, who had been in the colony about one year, died at Charlestown, leaving half of his whole property and his entire library (about 300 volumes) to the institution.”

The Constitution of Massachusetts, framed in 1780, expressly declares that “our wise and pious ancestors, so early as the year one thousand six hundred and thirty-six, laid the foundation of HARVARD COLLEGE.” — *University Catalogue*, p. 16.

would suddenly light up, and represent, by its exquisite mobility, the nice gradation of mirth, of reproach, or of sympathy which it was necessary to convey; and when his resources of facial expression seemed inadequate to illustrate the mastering sentiment, they would be assisted by gesticulation full of energy and grace. That bright, entertaining gossip, resulting from extensive travel and intimacy with the conspicuous personages of his time, was generally tethered in some way or other to the serious purpose of his life. No doubt Mr. Vattemare's decisions were often rough, and by no means closed the subject upon which they were uttered. He disclosed his passing feelings and opinions with utter frankness. Absorbed in his great work of diffusing knowledge among the nations, he would wear his heart upon his sleeve for daws to peck at,—a circumstance which the daws, as their nature is, did not leave unnoticed. Report our unguarded talk, and the best of us are vulnerable. The winged sentences of this man would be likely to fly through the nets of any reporter, were they set never so deftly; and such stragglers as might be caught would fail to convey the true emphasis of his discourse. It is perhaps doubtful whether reminiscences of conversation ought to be preserved. We can never supply the social medium in which the dead words were once alive and penetrative; the reader may easily receive a false impression as he hurries over them. So much it seems well to say before resigning this manuscript to such fate as shall befall it: I venture to hope that it will not be printed.

And now what claims has Mr. Vattemare to the notice of a society pledged to the right reading of Massachusetts history? I think they are these: First, to him, more than to any other man, we owe the foundation of the great public library which is the pride of this city. Second, his brilliant life-work — of which this was but one of the beneficent results — has been obscured by vague and irresponsible innuendo. His name has been associated, if not with actual reproach, at least with a slur of interrogation, the justice of which I emphatically deny. As testimony to the existence of these shadows of depreciation which have beclouded the name of Alexandre Vattemare, I cannot do better than quote an admirable summary of a portion of his achievements given by Mr. Justin Winsor in the "Memorial History of Boston."

"Whatever we think of Vattemare, *whether we call him an enthusiast or something worse or better*, we must recognize his contagious energy, which induced State after State to succumb to his representations, so that by 1853 he had brought one hundred and thirty libraries and institutions within his operations, and between 1847 and 1851 had brought from France for American libraries 30,655 volumes, beside maps, engravings, etc."¹

This is truly a record of brilliant achievement; one going far to justify the prophecy of our minister to France, Mr. Cass, that Alexandre Vattemare would be "ranked among the benefactors of mankind, and like them be rewarded with universal esteem." But why the non-committalism of judgment contained in the words which I have emphasized? Before attempting to answer the question, let me say that I have no reflection to make upon the historian for writing just as he did. He implies, in language properly cautious and reserved, the existence of a fog of suspicion which somehow had come to obscure the outline of an heroic figure. It certainly had obscured it; and Mr. Winsor is not to be blamed for hinting at the fact.

After such inquiry as I have been able to make I can discover but two sources whence may have come a chill upon that cordial recognition of a useful career which was emphatically its due. I will mention them in the inverse order of their importance.

At the close of our civil war Mr. Hypolite Vattemare wished to carry on the system for the international exchange of books which his father had so successfully inaugurated. But it was soon rumored that this gentleman had been one of the writers upon American affairs for the "*Patrie*," a journal bitterly hostile to the preservation of the Union. Mr. F. W. Seward, representing the State Department, commented upon this intelligence with an asperity which was as natural as its implied deductions were inconsequential. Negotiations were abruptly closed; and at that time it doubtless happened that the well-earned fame of the elder Vattemare suffered some eclipse before a nation to whose service he had been especially devoted. This was probably one of the causes — although here in Boston it was certainly the least important cause — of the misjudgment to which allusion has been made.

¹ Memorial History of Boston, vol. iv. p. 286, note.

There was a voice which many years ago proceeded out of a once influential nucleus of opinion in this city, and that voice was understood, upon some occasion or other, to have pronounced Mr. Vattemare a charlatan. I shall not try to individualize this astonishing utterance. It is sufficient to say that it was one of quite a number of hasty judgments which came from a small circle of considerable pretension — and, in many respects, of eminent desert — to which the late Mr. Thomas B. Curtis gave a designation of some felicity. He used to distinguish this core and centre of intellectual Boston from its more or less vulgar outlying dependencies under the title of “Boston Proper.” In topography the term is familiar enough: the humor lay in the new meaning put into it by a slightly sarcastic emphasis which I cannot hope to imitate successfully. And truly in those good old days — back some thirty or forty years in the past — there was a Boston within Boston, cultured, moral, conservative, and — *proper*. I feel great tenderness for this dead Boston proper. I was brought up in it — or, I might more modestly say, on the outskirts of it — and should like nothing better than to chronicle its many virtues, of which I am fully conscious. It had provincial characteristics, good as well as bad, and it is to our loss that we have fallen away from some of its standards of living. Nevertheless, there was in it a certain narrowness of perception, which could not easily admit the merit of contemporary character which influenced the world outside its own very respectable boundaries. It was apt to take its own notions of what was proper as a criterion for the rest of mankind; it would in all honesty say its Sunday prayer “for all sorts and conditions of men,” but found some difficulty in a week-day effort to understand them and to do them justice. I do not care to repeat the grotesque decisions which, when a boy, I remember to have heard its oracular voices utter concerning Ralph Waldo Emerson, then in the earlier part of his career. Neither is there need of recalling the indiscriminating epithets which I have heard those same voices apply — I will not say to men of aggressive personality like Garrison and Theodore Parker, but to prominent members of the old Free Soil party; some of them members, perhaps, of this very reputable Society, whose names it will be better taste in me not to mention. We smile in recalling these foolish judgments. The worthy citi-

zens alluded to have gone in and out before us for a generation since those grievous misapprehensions were uttered. They have hosts of friends eager to report them and their cause aright to the unsatisfied. Biographies are not, or will not be, wanting to throw the most favorable light upon whatever they did that was good, and to conceal in graceful shadow such human frailties as they did not escape. What do we care for some evil name that this prejudiced Boston proper may once have flung at them? It did not stick. In the case of Mr. Vattemare it did stick. He was a foreigner, one of a nation always under suspicion of revolutionary vehemence; his methods were not in accordance with the sober movements dear to the Anglo-Saxon temperament; he left among us no band of champions bound by every social and family tie to do him justice; and so it came to pass that the hasty word of disparagement which was cast at him left a mark which is not yet effaced.

Before passing from the subject I think it right to mention — though surely not to press — a suggestion which has been made as having had something to do with the obscuration which has befallen Mr. Vattemare's good name. The parable tells us that the men who were called earliest into the vineyard begrudged an equal payment to those whose work began at the eleventh hour. The complaint is characteristic of human nature; and a yet darker termination of the story would not discredit it as a picture of what might be in the heart of man. How if some laborer called into the vineyard in the cool of the evening, in order to magnify the importance of his own service, had been tempted to deny even an equal recompense to the toiler who had borne the burden and the heat of the day! Some suggestion equivalent to this has, in other years, been made by the friends of Mr. Vattemare, who were puzzled to account for the scant justice which has been done him. But such an explanation is unnecessary, and, in view of our inability to unravel the complexity of human motives, should not be hastily adopted.

I now come to the pleasanter duty of saying something about the man. Alexandre Vattemare was born in Paris near the close of the last century. In 1814, when still a youth, his acquaintance with surgery — for which profession he was studying — caused him to be placed in charge of several hundred

Prussian soldiers, and he was subsequently selected to accompany them to Berlin. Here some political movements resulted in his detention as a prisoner of war. While in captivity he amused himself by exercising his power of ventriloquism at the expense of the commandant and other officers, frightening them with strange noises, which they regarded as supernatural. It was by the advice of one of the military gentlemen thus befooled that he determined to use his remarkable powers as a means of support. At least this was Mr. Vattemare's account, so far as it is preserved in this record of conversations, though I have elsewhere seen the statement that a desire to relieve the wants of a French family of utter strangers to him was a potent factor in shaping his career.

Mr. Winsor gives Mr. Vattemare's bread-winning profession as that of a conjurer. The word is certainly misleading. He is better described as an actor, or personator, of very uncommon powers. Had he been associated with a metropolitan stage and performed single parts in the plays there represented, his fame would undoubtedly have passed into literature like that of Garrick or Talma. But Alexandre — for under that name Vattemare exercised his art — was something more than what is now called a star actor; he was also a supporting company. He was the creator of a delightful form of entertainment which the elder Mathews afterwards imitated with considerable success. He had been known to represent no less than forty-four characters in a single evening, giving to each a distinct individuality. The testimony of Sir Walter Scott, and others of critical eminence, to the extraordinary personations and transformations of this man account for the crowds that flocked to his entertainments. Before 1819 the fame of the wonderful Alexandre had extended through Germany and Austria, and penetrated to Hungary and Poland. After a visit to the Netherlands he proceeded to Great Britain, where ample harvests of renown and profit awaited him. During his travels Vattemare had been received and fêted by three emperors and by quite a rabble of kings. He had also won the friendship of many of the most distinguished men and women of the time, as the collection of letters which he called his *Album Cosmopolite* abundantly showed. His receipts were enormous, and his charities were in proportion to them. In Dublin alone his donations to public uses are said to have exceeded a thousand

pounds. Of the one hundred thousand rubles received for a visit to St. Petersburg, one half was given to the inhabitants of a Russian town that was destroyed by fire. But soon a larger charity than could be wrought by generous gifts of money began to occupy the attention of this much-followed performer.

In every city he visited, Mr. Vattemare's tastes would lead him to the libraries; and I have heard him describe the feelings that came over him upon seeing books piled together, or glued to their shelves as if under the spell of some malign enchantment, while all about them were ignorance and apathy. The libraries in the European capitals were, to be sure, nominally free; but the cataloguing was very imperfect, and red tape often held their doors against the people as securely as iron bars. There were small facilities for acquiring new books, and the subjects treated in the old ones had very little to do with the life that was then being lived. There were huge volumes devoted to controversial theology or to the discussion of insoluble transcendental problems; there was a great deal that concerned the Greeks and the Romans, but which had no special bearing upon questions which modern men must answer, or perish. And as the popular actor wandered among those lonely alcoves, there was flashed upon him what the next advance in civilization ought to be. The dumb oracles must be made to speak. The stagnant reservoirs of the past must be filled from the living fountains of the present, and the masses invited to quench their thirst. Was not this a sound conclusion? If we could transport ourselves back sixty years into the past, we should have no doubt that this was the work of practical utility next in order to be done. And a man had been found to do it, — one ready to resign the flatteries and the luxuries which fortune was heaping upon him, and to go forth as a knight-errant in the cause of the intellectual emancipation of the people.

About the year 1827 Mr. Vattemare began to devote his time, energy, and property to the introduction of his system of the international exchange of books, and, incidentally, of any products of nature or human skill which might increase knowledge in science or art. To borrow the language of its author, the system was "designed to give the intellectual treasures of the cultivated world the same dissemination and equali-

zation which commerce has already given to its material ones ; " and the outcome was to be " the establishment in every quarter of the world of free public libraries and museums ever open to the use of the people." A just estimate of his plan of procedure is scarcely to be had from our present position. One of the best tests of its excellence is the fact that the popularization of libraries, which it was its object to promote, has rendered its continuance unnecessary. The fresh thought and invention of the nations is now open to all as a matter of course. It was the merit of Vattemare to create a sentiment that has caused methods which were once the best to be superseded by those which are still better. Success in amusing the public was now used simply as a means towards accomplishing the end he had in view. To adopt his own expression as preserved in these records, " When Vattemare failed to interest the attention, or gain admission to important personages, Alexandre took his place and carried the day."

The labors of twelve years, pursued, in the words of Arago, " with a generosity almost unparalleled in modern times," were abundantly successful in introducing the system of international exchanges throughout Europe. And then was undertaken that mission to America which Lafayette had so strongly urged. In 1839 Mr. Vattemare landed in New York. " My first sentiments," he says, " were those of despair, for I found no institutions like our own open to the public, and therefore no means of laying the treasures which I proposed to bring into the United States before the people." Happily the despair was only momentary. If there was more work to be done, he would make further draughts upon his indomitable energy and do it. He must not only bring books for the people, but must create free libraries to put them in. This is not the place to detail the tireless labors by which his plans were developed and brought to the attention of those who had the power to further them. They were finally indorsed by both Houses of Congress, as well as by the legislatures of some of the States. Many of the most eminent men of the country became his friends, and gave efficient aid in carrying out his work. It is with regret that I pass over the interesting incidents of Mr. Vattemare's career in America, and limit myself to what he did in Boston towards the foundation of the municipal library which our citizens now enjoy.

On the 5th of May, 1841, a meeting was held in this city to take into consideration the plans for popularizing knowledge advocated by this ardent Frenchman. He urged the creation of an institution embracing within itself the existing libraries and the collections of scattered societies. An excellent committee was appointed who should make a serious attempt to carry out Mr. Vattemare's idea of a great library free to all the people. "The author of this plan," said the committee, "unfolded it with a minuteness of detail, both in regard to itself and to its results, which showed the meeting how deeply in earnest he was, and how easy he thought it would be to carry it into the fullest effect." Notwithstanding the labors of the gentlemen he had interested, it was found that the liberal views of our visitor could not then be realized. It was the old story of jealousy, and unwillingness or inability to co-operate on the part of those whom circumstances had placed in positions of authority. But repulse came to a man who was hardened to it, and who would cling all the more tenaciously to an idea with which his personality had become identified. After six more years of unremitted effort for the diffusion of knowledge, Mr. Vattemare returned to Boston, and succeeded in establishing the free public library that he was determined that we should have.

"The foundation of the noble municipal library which now adorns the city of Boston," writes Mr. Edward Edwards in his "History of Free Town Libraries," "may be traced to the year 1847 as the date of its virtual commencement, although for more than three years after that date the initiatory steps were not very actively or successfully followed up." Chief among these initiatory steps, which the historian truly declares founded the library, was that taken by Alexandre Vattemare, who brought a valuable collection of books from the city of Paris, and made an urgent appeal to the municipal authorities to take immediate measures for the establishment of the free library which should adorn Boston. He told them, with the sublime assurance of a prophet, that then was the accepted time; the books received from France must be made the nucleus of a great public institution. During his visits to Boston in 1847 and 1848 the idea of establishing a free library in this city seemed to pervade him even to his fingers' ends. He followed it up with a vehemence which might well startle the guardians

of the sluggish properties. He pursued the Mayor with visits and by correspondence; he wrought upon that functionary to make a conditional offer of \$5,000 towards providing books for the library, and to see that a petition was sent to the legislature for permission to levy taxes for its support. It was upon the legislative act of 1848, obtained by the persistent zeal of Mr. Vattemare, that the superstructure of our public library has been reared. It was that room in City Hall, set apart to receive the books he generously brought us, which gave it a local habitation and a name.

Is it said that the initial offering of Mr. Vattemare seems insignificant when compared with the gifts of money or of service which afterwards built up the library? It is insignificant as the bequest of John Harvard is insignificant when placed beside those costly benefactions which have made his College what it is to-day. Both these men gave at the right moment, and without them the dates of the foundations of beneficent institutions would be other than they are. But the outcome of an exuberant and devoted life is not to be compared with any dead man's legacy, however opportunely it may have been received. Neither can we measure our obligations to Mr. Vattemare by the time he spent in this city, nor by the energy he gave to the furtherance of our special work. Human words are something more than articulate sounds equal each to the other: the right man must speak them if they are to liberate pent-up forces. We can estimate the worth of that initiatory impulse only by remembering the long years of labor which had preceded it. A past generation was constrained to listen to this Frenchman because he bore the indorsements of distinguished men both in Europe and America,—men whose indorsements were to be gained only by eminent desert.

No past depreciation of Mr. Vattemare should tempt us to speak of him otherwise than justly. It is not to be denied that certain epithets which, as commonly used, are not commendatory, might be applied to him. Perhaps some gentleman here present may tell us that he met Mr. Vattemare when in this country, and that he impressed him as an egotist and an enthusiast. I must admit the egotism, and will only plead in extenuation that the stage-performer who can give the public supreme delight has a tendency to self-appreciation

which, if not necessitated by the molecular construction of his nervous system, is forced upon him by his exceptional environment. He is followed by admiring crowds wherever he goes; wealth and flattery are poured upon him; his society is sought, not only by royalty and nobility, but by contemporaries deservedly famous in the different spheres of human action. Almost of necessity, I say, such a man must think too highly of his own consequence. We do not expect him to conceive the cosmos comprehensively or with critical accuracy; no one doubts that he will place himself somewhat too near the centre of it. We have reason to be satisfied if men possessing this perilous endowment lead an outwardly respectable life, talk on the whole virtuously to their numerous interviewers, and occasionally give some popular charity the lift of a benefit. The comic actor, in the prologue of Goethe's immortal drama, excuses himself for caring about posterity, seeing that he has business enough in looking after contemporary fun. To most men the excuse would seem sufficient; to Mr. Vattemare it was not sufficient. His success in making contemporary fun was valued only because it placed him in a position to devote his life to the useful service of the world. What other successful actor can be mentioned who so regarded his opportunities of money-getting and of admission to courtly and gracious companies? But Mr. Vattemare has been called an enthusiast. If he is rightly described by the word, it must be used in its original signification, as one who acts under the constraint of the universal spirit which concerns itself with the whole. There is a meaning, more common in English speech, which implies a man of little judgment who throws himself away in pursuing impracticable Utopias. If the word is used in this sense, Mr. Vattemare is the last man it correctly describes. He proclaimed a true social want. Given a civilization based upon human knowledge and which had reached a certain point, he told men the next thing to be done, and proved his foresight by doing it. Enthusiasts such as he move the world; without them we should be repeating the life of the dark ages, or perhaps that of the cave men.

And here it will not be out of place to mention Mr. Vattemare's views upon a matter that has lately been somewhat discussed. Since the general establishment of free libraries, there have arisen questions touching their proper function.

Should they supply ephemeral works of fiction, seasoned, many of them, to gratify a morbid appetite, and giving false ideas of the conditions of human life and the requirements of duty? Above all, what are we to say to a State which postulates in its constitution the existence of a Supreme Being, to whom man is accountable, and bases its apparatus for maintaining justice upon this assertion, and then proceeds to tax its citizens, that the mass of the people, including the young and inexperienced, may be provided with speciously written books which deny this primal affirmation? I know the difficulty of drawing dividing lines. It would always have been very hard; now I hold it to be impossible. Democracy takes no backward step; it will never give up a concession. If we have gained wisdom through experience, we are wise, as the saying goes, after the event. Mr. Vattemare was wise before the event. The books which he devoted his life to bring to the doors of the people should contain profitable knowledge: they must be edifying; they must tend to build up good citizens. And so, when the authors of France offered him copies of their works to bring to America, he declined some of them as writings which free libraries were under no obligation to provide; among those declined were certain books by the most popular writers of their time. Mr. Vattemare may have shown his own limitation in some of these judgments; I am not concerned to defend them as always correct. But, allowing for what the astronomers call the personal error, the instinct behind it was worthy of respect. And when, years ago, we decided that another impost should be laid upon our heavily taxed citizens to the end that in all our towns the boys and girls as they left the free schools might be provided with free libraries,—when we were about to establish the traditions of institutions then in embryo,—we may well raise the question whether they would not have been higher educational agencies, had we adopted Mr. Vattemare's view of the true purpose of their existence.

I have confined myself to a notice of those parts of Mr. Vattemare's career which may claim the recognition of this Society. Of the work he did in Europe, this is not the occasion to speak. His love for America was unbounded, and his zeal in our service often put to shame that of our

paid officials. It was owing to his exertions that this country was represented in the French Exhibition of 1856. The flag of every nation in Europe was to float over that beautiful building; and he declared, with that wonderful energy which made light of obstacles, that the stars and stripes should be displayed there also. The show that he conjured into existence was meagre enough, and provoked a smile from his transatlantic friends. "Ah, you may laugh at my exhibition," exclaimed Mr. Vattemare, with the exultant glee of a school-boy; "but it has put your good flag up aloft, and you will see it will win for you some medals and honorable mentions!"

The muse of History has sometimes been described as prejudiced and purchasable; but the sub-muse of Local History, if mythology may be enriched with such a personage, is far more open to such accusations. She approaches the urn under strong social and pecuniary bias, and often draws out singular names to receive our homage. If one of the names therein contained is that of a foreigner, she is pretty sure not to find it. And what does it matter? Nothing surely to Alexandre Vattemare; something, perhaps, to the community which overlooks his services, and cares not if a shade of unjust suspicion has come to rest upon his name. Nevertheless, this rare type of man is as worthy of study — yes, and of admiration — as any book that he ever brought us. He seems to me a figure well-nigh unique. An enthusiast, if you will, but one whose head was never in the clouds; one who would feed his fellows with wholesome food, never with wild theories, exaggerations, and unrealities. He was clear-sighted as well as unselfish, and so devoted his life to the diffusion of that higher human experience which differentiates civilized man from the savage and the brute.

Judge CHAMBERLAIN referred to the alleged signing of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776, and gave some reasons for his conclusion that the printed Public Journal of Congress, so far as it relates to that event, is untrustworthy. This paper, which he communicated by title only, proclaims no new discovery. The subject, he said, has been often discussed, and the facts relating to it have been publicly stated. Yet the old error prevails, and has been repeated by writers

of historical repute. It seems necessary not only to disprove it, but to show how it originated. This is the object of the paper.

The Authentication of the Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776.

Few historical events which have occasioned controversy are referred to definite time and place by such overwhelming weight of authority, personal and documentary, as that which assigns the authentication of the Declaration of Independence, by the signatures of the members of Congress, to Independence Hall, in Philadelphia, July 4, 1776. After it had been called in question, this was distinctly affirmed by two of the most eminent of the persons then present, one of whom was the author of the Declaration, and the other the most powerful advocate of the resolution on which it was based; and their concurring statements appear to be corroborated by memoranda claimed to have been written at the time, as well as by the printed official Journal of the Congress of which both were members; and yet it is more than probable that both eye-witnesses were mistaken and the memoranda unreliable, while the printed Journal is demonstrably misleading. This is all the more extraordinary since the error relates to an event in respect to which error is hardly predicable. It is not a question as to what took place on some widely extended battle-field crowded with struggling combatants, but as to what passed directly under the eyes of fifty intelligent gentlemen in the quiet and secret session of the Continental Congress.

The question is this: Was the draught of the Declaration of Independence, which, after various amendments, was finally agreed to on the afternoon of July 4, forthwith engrossed on paper and thereupon subscribed by all the members then present except Dickinson? This is affirmed by Adams and Jefferson, and in this the printed Journal seems to sustain them. But this, Thomas McKean, himself a signer, present on the 4th, and voting for the Declaration, has explicitly denied; and so have Force,¹ Bancroft,² Webster,³ and Winthrop.⁴ With some

¹ The Declaration of Independence, p. 63.

² History of the United States, vol. viii. p. 475.

³ Works, vol. i. p. 129.

⁴ Fourth of July Oration, 1876, p. 28.

variation in phrase, these writers agree with Mr. Webster, who says that on the 4th "it was ordered, that copies be sent to the several States, and that it be proclaimed at the head of the army. The Declaration thus published did not bear the names of the members, for as yet it had not been signed by them. It was authenticated, like other papers of the Congress, by the signatures of the President and Secretary."

Of the more recent writers, Frothingham, in his "Rise of the Republic" (page 545, note), and Randall, in his "Life of Jefferson" (vol. i. p. 171, note), unable to see their way in this conflict of authority, have left the matter in doubt; while Dr. Lossing, who had said that "the Declaration of Independence was signed by John Hancock, the President of Congress, only, on the day of its adoption, and thus it went forth to the world,"¹ having re-examined the question, or convinced by the statements of Mrs. Nellie Hess Morris,² has changed his opinion, and now affirms that it was engrossed on paper and signed on the 4th, by all the members who voted for it, and subsequently on parchment, and again signed on the 2d of August in the form well known in fac-simile.³

The first to challenge the commonly received opinion that the Declaration of Independence was engrossed, and then signed by the members of Congress, on July 4, was Thomas McKean. Shortly after Governor McKean's death, in 1817, John Adams sent to Hezekiah Niles eight letters, written to him by McKean between June 8, 1812, and June 17, 1817. These letters were published in Niles's "Weekly Register" for July 12, 1817 (vol. xii. p. 305 *et seq.*). In one of them, dated Jan. 7, 1814, which is too long to be given in full, but which may be found *ut supra*, and also in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society (vol. xlv. p. 505), Governor McKean says:—

"On the 1st of July, 1776, the question [on the Declaration] was taken in committee of the whole of Congress, when Pennsylvania, represented by seven members then present, voted against it, four to three. Among the majority were Robert Morris and John Dickinson. Delaware (having only two present, namely, myself and Mr. Read) was divided. All the other States voted in favor of it. The report

¹ Field Book of the Revolution, vol. ii. p. 79.

² Potter's American Monthly, vols. iv.-v. p. 498.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 754.

was delayed until the 4th; and in the mean time I sent an express for Cæsar Rodney to Dover, in the county of Kent, in Delaware, at my private expense, whom I met at the State House door, on the 4th of July, in his boots. He resided eighty miles from the city, and just arrived as Congress met. The question was taken. Delaware voted in favor of Independence. Pennsylvania (there being only five members present, Messrs. Dickinson and Morris absent) voted also for it. Messrs. Willing and Humphries were against it. Thus the thirteen States were unanimous in favor of Independence. Notwithstanding this, in the printed Public Journal of Congress for 1776 (vol. ii.) it appears that the Declaration of Independence was declared on the 4th of July, 1776, by the gentlemen whose names are there inserted, whereas no person signed it on that day; and among the names there inserted, one gentleman, namely, George Read, Esq., was not in favor of it; and seven were not in Congress on that day, namely, Messrs. Morris, Rush, Clymer, Smith, Taylor, and Ross, all of Pennsylvania, and Mr. Thornton, of New Hampshire; nor were the six gentlemen last named, members of Congress on the 4th of July. The five for Pennsylvania were appointed delegates by the convention of that State on the 20th July, and Thornton took his seat in Congress, for the first time, on the 4th November following; when the names of Henry Wisner, of New York, and Thomas McKean, of Delaware, are not printed as subscribers, though both were present in Congress on the 4th of July and voted for Independence. . . . After the 4th of July, I was not in Congress for several months, having marched with a regiment of Associators, as Colonel, to support General Washington, until the flying camp of ten thousand men was completed. When the Associators were discharged, I returned to Philadelphia, took my seat in Congress, and signed my name to the Declaration on parchment."

In transmitting this letter to Mercy Warren for her reading, John Adams said: —

"I send you a curiosity. Mr. McKean is mistaken in a day or two. The final vote of independence, after the last debate, was passed on the 2d or 3d of July, and the Declaration prepared and signed on the 4th.

"What are we to think of history, when, in less than forty years, such diversities appear in the memories of living persons who were witnesses?

"After noting what you please, I pray you to return the letter. I should like to communicate it to Gerry, Paine, and Jefferson, to stir up their pure minds."

Governor McKean's recollection was certainly at fault in one or two particulars. His patriotic and successful endeavor to

bring Rodney up from Delaware was that he might vote on the main question, — the Resolution of Independence, which passed the 2d of July. It is doubtful, also, whether he was correct in saying that Wisner, of New York, voted either for the resolution or for the Declaration; for, though he may have been in favor of independence, the delegates from that State were not authorized so to vote until July 9, nor was their authority communicated to Congress before July 15.¹ McKean was in error on some collateral points; but was John Adams right and McKean wrong on the main question, — the signing of the Declaration on the 4th? It is premature to pronounce until all the evidence is produced; but there is a noticeable letter, written by John Adams to Samuel Chase, from Philadelphia, July 9, in which he says: "As soon as an American seal is prepared, I conjecture the Declaration will be subscribed by all the members, which will give you the opportunity you wish for, of transmitting your name among the votaries of independence."² From this it is clear that Chase, whose name appears on the printed Journal of the 4th as a signer, was not in Philadelphia on that day, nor until after the 9th; and a question arises, why Chase, on his return to Philadelphia, should not have signed that Declaration which John Adams says he and others signed on the 4th, instead of waiting for the general subscription, which he conjectured would take place after the preparation of an American seal. The following entry in the Journal shows that Carroll was not in Congress until after that date, though his name is entered on the same Journal, when printed, under 4th July, as then present and signing the Declaration: —

July 18. "The delegates from Maryland laid before Congress the credentials of a new appointment made by their convention, which were read as follows: —

"In Convention, Annapolis, July 4, 1776.

*"Resolved, That the honorable Matthew Tilghman, Esq; and Thomas Johnson, Jun., William Paca, Samuel Chase, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, and Robert Alexander, Esqrs.; or a majority of them, or any three or more of them, be deputies to represent this colony in Congress, etc. etc. . . . Extract from the minutes: G. DUVAL, Clerk."*³

¹ Journal of Congress, vol. ii. p. 265.

² Works, vol. ix. p. 421.

³ Journal of Congress, vol. ii. p. 273. The addition to the name of Charles Carroll, in the above resolve, of the words "of Carrollton," shows that such was

But the most particular and apparently the most irrefragable statement in favor of the popular belief that the Declaration was signed on the 4th by the members then present, except Dickinson, is found in Jefferson's memoranda, and also in his letter of May 12, 1819, to Samuel Adams Wells.¹ And first, the memoranda. At the end of the Declaration, on page 21, Jefferson has appended the following:—

“The Declaration, thus signed on the 4th, on paper, was engrossed on parchment, and signed again on the 2d of August.”

And in brackets:—

“Some erroneous statements of the proceedings on the Declaration of Independence having got before the public in latter times, Mr. Samuel A. Wells asked explanations of me, which are given in my letter to him of May 12, '19, before and now again referred to. I took notes in my place while these things were going on, and at their close wrote them out in form and with correctness; and from one to seven of the two preceding sheets are the originals then written.”

In the margin the editor informs us that the above note is on a slip of paper, pasted in at the end of the Declaration. There is also, he tells us, sewed into the manuscript a slip of newspaper, containing McKean's letter, from which it ap-

his common designation before he signed the Declaration of Independence. Carroll, though he had a large property at stake, was one of the most ardent of the patriots, and as impatient as any of his associates at the delay of his colony to take the ground of independence; and on the very day on which the printed Journal represents him as at Philadelphia, and signing the Declaration, he was at Annapolis, where he had been for some time engaged in the finally successful effort to bring the recalcitrant Assembly to the point of voting the resolve quoted in the text. Due consideration of the significance of the foregoing facts begets doubt respecting the story which has been widely circulated and has gained some credence. It is to the effect that when the members were signing the engrossed copy of the Declaration, August 2, Hancock, with some implied allusion to his own large fortune supposed to be imperilled by his signing, asked Carroll, who also was rich, “if *he* intended to sign.” Perhaps there was nothing in the character of Hancock which would have prevented his asking such a question; but certain facts stand in the way. Carroll took his seat July 18. The next day, Congress voted that the Declaration, when engrossed, *should be signed by every member of that body*. So that, if Carroll's patriotic efforts at Annapolis, which secured to himself and his delegation the right to vote, left any doubt as to his intention in that regard, the above vote of Congress renders the insolent question attributed to Hancock altogether improbable. The same may be said as to the alleged addition to Carroll's signature of the words “of Carrollton” in consequence of the taunt of a bystander that their omission might save him his estate.

¹ Jefferson's Writings, Boston ed., 1830, vol. i. pp. 20, 94.

pears that Jefferson intended to make an issue of fact with Governor McKean.

Jefferson, in his letter to Wells, says:—

“It was not till the 2d of July that the Declaration itself was taken up, nor till the 4th that it was decided; and it was signed by every member present except Mr. Dickinson. The subsequent signatures of members who were not then present, and some of them not yet in office, is easily explained if we observe who they were; to wit, that they were of New York and Pennsylvania. . . . Why the signature of Thornton, of New Hampshire, was permitted so late as the 4th of November, I cannot now say.”

It is important to notice that when Jefferson speaks of a “Declaration thus signed,” he must have had before him one that bore the signatures of the New York and Pennsylvania delegates, as well as that of Thornton, of New Hampshire, as he mentions them.

The letter to Wells bore date May 12, 1819. On Aug. 6, 1822, more than three years later, he added the following postscript to a copy which he had preserved:—

“Since the date of this letter, to wit, this day, August 6, '22, I have received the new publication of the Secret Journals of Congress, wherein is stated a resolution of July 19, 1776, that the Declaration passed on the 4th be fairly engrossed on parchment, and when engrossed, be signed by every member; and another of August 2d, that being engrossed and compared at the table, it was signed by the members.”

As neither the resolution of July 19 nor the signing on parchment of August 2 appear, except, as hereafter given, in his memoranda of matters he “took notes of in his place while these things were going on,” and as he was certainly in his place August 2, when he signed the parchment Declaration, it is not surprising that he was disturbed when they came to his notice, nearly fifty years later, since he had apparently forgotten them.

It is true he says, “The Declaration thus signed on the 4th, on paper, was engrossed on parchment, and signed again on the 2d August.” The latter date shows that the entry was made a month after the first alleged signing. “The Declaration thus signed,” to which he refers, and which he had before him, contained the signature of Thornton, which carries

the date forward as late as November 4; and there is no evidence of the existence of a printed copy of the Declaration with the signatures of the members attached, before that issued under a resolution of Congress, Jan. 18, 1777; and the imprint of the official journal which contains the names of the signers is of the same year. From these facts it seems to follow that Mr. Jefferson's memoranda were made later than that date.

We now proceed to a more careful examination of these memoranda. If they were made by Jefferson at the close of each day, or within a few days after the transactions they record, they would settle the question against any amount of opposing testimony of less authoritative character. But it is evident, on critical consideration, that such of these memoranda as relate to the signing of the Declaration on the 4th of July were made up with the printed Public Journal before him; and as that did not appear until the next year, his notes lose the authority of contemporaneous entries. Indeed, he tells us himself that the statement of facts, as we have it, was made up "at their close."

It is not a little remarkable that, with the printed Journal of July 4, which bore Thornton's signature of November 4, before him, Jefferson should not have asked himself how that name should be found, not upon the *Declaration*, but upon the *Journal* of that day. When Thornton came down from New Hampshire in November, he doubtless signed the parchment Declaration, in compliance with the order of July 19, "that the same, when engrossed, be signed by every member of Congress." Though coming late, Thornton was a member of that Congress. In order to make Jefferson's assumption effective, the clerk must then have produced the paper Declaration and requested Thornton to sign *that*. But neither of those signings would put Thornton's name on the *Journal* of the 4th. It could have come *there* only by the clerk's false entry that Thornton was present and signed on the 4th; for the entries of July 4, July 19, and August 2 are in the handwriting of Charles Thomson. To state this supposition is to contradict it. Nor is Jefferson's way out of the difficulty more clear if we accept Mr. Randall's¹ solution, which

¹ Randall's *Jefferson*, vol. i. p. 173, note.

seems to be adopted by Dr. Lossing,¹ that the non-appearance of the paper Declaration to-day is to be accounted for by the presumption that it was destroyed as useless when the parchment was signed August 2; for had that been the case Thornton's name would not have appeared on an instrument destroyed three months before he entered Congress.

The real state of the case begins to appear: *the printed Public Journal for July 4, 1776, varies from the original.* There are three publications which purport to give the proceedings of the Old Congress, in whole or in part. The first is entitled "Journals of Congress. Containing the Proceedings in the year 1776." The proceedings for July, 1776, were not officially published until more than six months after their occurrence. The last entry in the Journal for that year is December 31; and the preparation of the copy, with a full index, would probably delay its publication until the spring of 1777. For more than forty years this was the only Journal known to the public. It was that which Adams and Jefferson had before them when they so explicitly stated that the Declaration of Independence was signed by the members present, July 4. This printed Journal appears to sustain them in that statement.

The second of these Journals is entitled the "Secret Journals of the Acts and Proceedings of Congress," and was first published in 1821, in four volumes, agreeably to Congressional Resolves. These volumes contain those records of domestic and foreign affairs which Congress thought wise to keep from the public eye, and are found in manuscript volumes distinct from those which contain the Public Journals.

The wisdom, secrecy, or timidity of Congress is clear from the fact that the three resolutions, one of them relating to independence, which Richard Henry Lee moved on the 7th June, 1776, are referred to in the Journal of that day only as "certain resolutions respecting independency;" nor were they ever extended on the records, and only became known in the manner presently to be explained. On the 10th one of these resolutions was set out by way of recital.

The third of these Journals is found in Force's "American Archives," which is not the Journal kept by Charles Thom-

¹ Potter's American Monthly, vols. iv.-v. p. 755.

son, the clerk of the Old Congress, but an account of the proceedings of Congress made up from the Journals above described, and the minutes, documents, and letters preserved in files by the clerk. It lacks the authority which appertains to a journal extended by a sworn clerk of the body whose proceedings it records; but, nevertheless, it is doubtless the most authentic account of the transactions of Congress which we possess. From the files Force printed the original paper which contained Lee's famous resolutions.¹

With this account of these several Journals I now propose to bring them together, so far as relates to the Declaration of Independence. It will be understood that in speaking of the Journals of Congress I refer in all cases, unless otherwise specified, to the *printed Journals*.

Proceedings according to the Public Journal.

July 4, 1776. Agreeable to the order of the day, the Congress resolved itself into a committee of the whole, to take into their farther consideration the declaration; and after some time the president resumed the chair, and Mr. Harrison reported, that the committee have agreed to a declaration, which they desired him to report.

The declaration being read, was agreed to, as follows:—

A DECLARATION *by the Representatives of the UNITED STATES of AMERICA in Congress assembled.*

[Here follows the Declaration in the form we have it.]

The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members:—

John Hancock.

New Hampshire.

Josiah Bartlett.

William Whipple.

Matthew Thornton.

Massachusetts-Bay.

Samuel Adams.

John Adams.

Robert Treat Paine.

Elbridge Gerry.

Rhode Island.

Stephen Hopkins.

William Ellery.

Connecticut.

Roger Sherman.

Samuel Huntington.

William Williams.

Oliver Wolcott.

New York.

William Floyd.

Philip Livingston.

¹ See fac-simile in American Archives, vol. vi. 4th ser. p. 1700.

Francis Lewis.
Lewis Morris.

New Jersey.

Richard Stockton.
John Witherspoon.
Francis Hopkinson.
John Hart.
Abraham Clark.

Pennsylvania.

Robert Morris.
Benjamin Rush.
Benjamin Franklin.
John Morton.
George Clymer.
James Smith.
George Taylor.
James Wilson.
George Ross.

Delaware.

Cæsar Rodney.
George Read.

Maryland.

Samuel Chase.
William Paca.

Thomas Stone.
Charles Carroll, of Carrollton.

Virginia.

George Wythe.
Richard Henry Lee.
Thomas Jefferson.
Benjamin Harrison.
Thomas Nelson, Jun.
Francis Lightfoot Lee.
Carter Braxton.

North Carolina.

William Hooper.
Joseph Hewes.
John Penn.

South Carolina.

Edward Rutledge.
Thomas Heyward, Jun.
Thomas Lynch, Jun.
Arthur Middleton.

Georgia.

Button Gwinnett.
Lyman Hall.
George Walton.

Resolved, That copies of the declaration be sent to the several assemblies, conventions and committees, or councils of safety, and to the several commanding officers of the continental troops; that it be proclaimed in each of the United States, and at the head of the army.

In the Secret Journal there is no entry under the 4th of July, 1776.

*Proceedings in Congress 4th July, 1776, as given in Force's "Archives."*¹

Agreeable to the Order of the Day, the Congress resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, to take into their further consideration the Declaration; and, after some time, the President resumed the chair, and Mr. *Harrison* reported, that the Committee have agreed to a Declaration, which they desired him to report.

The Declaration being read, was agreed to, as follows:

[Here follows the Declaration, as in the Public Journal, *but without any signatures.*]

¹ 4th ser. vol. vi. p. 1729.

Ordered, That the Declaration be authenticated and printed. That the committee appointed to prepare the Declaration superintend and correct the press. *Resolved*, That copies of the Declaration be sent to the several assemblies [etc., as in the Public Journal].

The Secret Journal.

July 19, 1776. Resolved, That the Declaration passed on the 4th be fairly engrossed on parchment, with the title and style of "THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION of the THIRTEEN UNITED STATES of AMERICA;" and that the same, when engrossed, be signed by every member of Congress.¹

The Public Journal has no entry on this day respecting the Declaration; but the Proceedings in Force's "Archives" contain the resolve as above.²

The Secret Journal.

Aug. 2, 1776. The Declaration of Independence being engrossed, and compared at the table, was signed by the members.³

The same is found in Force's "Archives,"⁴ but not in the Public Journal.

The Public Journal.

January 18, 1777. *Ordered*, That an authenticated copy of the declaration of independency, with the names of the members of Congress, subscribing the same, be sent to each of the United States, and they be desired to have the same put upon record.⁵

Assuming that the entry in the Public Journal of July 4 is genuine, the above order is superfluous, since as *such*, it merely repeats the former order, and couples with it the expression of a desire that the several States would record it. The operative clause is to print the Declaration with the *names of the members signing it*. This was accordingly done, and for the *first time*. From the copy thus printed was made up the Journal of the 4th July, *as printed*; more than six months antecedent.

¹ Secret Journal, Domestic Affairs, vol. ii. p. 48.

² Force's Archives, 5th ser. vol. i. p. 1584.

³ Secret Journal, Domestic Affairs, vol. ii. p. 49.

⁴ Force's Archives, 5th ser. vol. i. p. 1597.

⁵ Journals of Congress, vol. iii. p. 28.

With these extracts from the Journals and Proceedings before us, and assisted by certain well-known and indisputable facts, it ought not to be difficult to discover the truth respecting the apparent signing of the Declaration of Independence on the 4th of July, 1776.

It will be observed that the statements of these Journals are inconsistent, if not contradictory. The Public Journal says, under date of July 4: —

“The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members.”

In the Proceedings the corresponding entry is as follows: —

“Ordered, That the Declaration be authenticated and printed. That the Committee appointed to prepare the Declaration superintend and correct the press.”

“Resolved, That copies of the Declaration be sent to the several assemblies,” etc.

Now, it is hardly conceivable that these inconsistent orders could have passed at the same time and in relation to the same subject-matter. One or the other of them must be incorrect. It is noticeable that what seems to be an order in the Public Journal is only a narrative of an alleged fact, namely, that “the foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed and signed by the following members.” It is pertinent to ask, By what order, and where is it recorded? The Journal contains no such order, nor do the files. Nothing exists independently of the above recital, to show that any such order was ever passed. Nor is the narrative a correct recital of facts. That is, it states what is known to be untrue, — in part, from subsequent entries in the Journal itself. The New York members, whose names are recorded as present and signing the Declaration on the 4th July, were not authorized to sign until the 9th, nor was that authority laid before Congress until the 15th. Of course they did not sign before that date. As we have already seen, Chase was not present on the 4th, nor was Carroll, who did not take his seat until the 18th.¹ Rush, Clymer, Taylor, and Ross, of Pennsylvania, whose names are recorded as signing on the 4th, were not

¹ Journals of Congress, vol. ii. p. 273.

chosen delegates until July 20;¹ nor did Thornton appear in Congress until the 4th of November.² So far as these delegates are concerned, the Public Journal, which represents them as present in Congress on the 4th of July and signing the Declaration, is clearly spurious.

In the next place, the record of the Public Journal as printed is at variance with known facts. If, as it asserts, the Declaration was signed on the 4th, it should be found in the files of that day; but search has repeatedly been made for it without success, nor has it ever been seen or heard of. It may have been lost; but there are facts making it by far more probable that it never existed. If the signatures of the delegates were affixed, in whole or in part, to the Declaration on the 4th, they formed an important part of the instrument, since they constituted its sole authorized and required authentication, when it was printed and sent to the several assemblies and read at the head of the army. We have the copies which were so sent and read. But these copies contain only the signatures of John Hancock, as President, and Charles Thomson, as Secretary, of the Congress, who claim to have signed it *in behalf and by order of* that body.³ So that, if the order of Congress, as is asserted by the Public Journal, was that the Declaration should be signed by the members, and so sent forth, then Hancock and Thomson must have caused it to be printed without these signatures, and falsely claimed that their own were added by authority. For not only cannot this original Declaration, which Jefferson says was signed by the delegates on the 4th, be found, but not even one of the printed copies which were ordered by Congress. This fact points to an inevitable conclusion. Such a paper never existed save on the false Journal as printed by Congress.

On the other hand, the proceedings and orders, as set forth in the "American Archives," strictly conform to congressional precedents. All its proclamations and similar public documents went forth under the authentication of the President and Secretary, unless otherwise ordered, as was the case with the Address to the King and other like addresses of the Congress of 1774. Any other method, save by express vote, would have been illegal. As the Declaration, though of the nature

¹ Journals of Congress, vol. ii. p. 277.

² *Ibid.*, p. 441.

³ The same authentication is given in the "Annual Register," 1776, p. 161.

of a legislative act, was in some respects out of the ordinary course, the President and Secretary might well seek instruction. Congress forthwith gave them directions to authenticate it and print it under direction of the committee that draughted it, and then send it to the assemblies and to the army. This was done immediately. Lossing has stated that the Declaration was agreed to about two o'clock in the afternoon. It was printed during that afternoon and evening, and the next day was sent forth to the world.¹ Copies of the Declaration are not rare. There is one in the library of the Historical Society; and a copy was printed at Salem, doubtless within a few days after the receipt of that distributed by order of Congress. Its authentication is as follows:—

Signed by order and in behalf of the Congress,

JOHN HANCOCK, *President.*

Attest, CHARLES THOMSON, Secretary.

The ordinary authentication was by the signatures of the President and Secretary, followed by their official title; and the peculiarity of the authentication of the Declaration in the use of the uncommon words, "Signed by order and in behalf of the Congress," shows that it was so authenticated by the express vote of that body.

In a word, the proceedings of Congress with respect to the Declaration, as contained in the "American Archives," and given above, conform to and account for all known facts; while the record of the same transaction, as found in the Public Journal, is contradicted by other entries in the same Journal, and is at variance with all the external circumstances attending and following the transaction.

But the case does not rest wholly upon the reasons given above. Thus far in this analysis I have confined myself to the printed Journals of Congress, and to such facts as are of public notoriety; and if the case were allowed to rest here, I trust it has been made to appear that the Public Journal of July 4, reciting that the Declaration of Independence was signed by the members of Congress on that day, is erroneous. But the error requires explanation as well as demonstration. The

¹ See note in Frothingham's "Rise of the Republic," p. 544, from which one might infer that the Declaration was published on the 4th.

error is in the printed Journal, which does not conform to the original manuscripts. Of these there are three, which are more fully described in the subjoined note.¹ Two of them relate to

¹ For the interesting facts given above I am indebted to the courtesy of S. M. Hamilton, Esq., of the State Department, Washington, who, in the absence of Theodore F. Dwight, Esq., to whom I had addressed some inquiries, has written the following letter, and its enclosures.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, Nov. 5, 1884.

DEAR SIR,— . . . I fail to discover any printed half-sheet of paper, with the names of the members afterwards in the printed Journals, stitched in. I have found, however, a printed copy of the Declaration, inserted in one of the manuscript Journals covering the period in question, and have, by the enclosures, endeavored to give an accurate idea of the same.

Three of the manuscript Journals of the Continental Congress cover July, 1776. One begins, or rather the first entry in it is, under date of May 25, 1776, and ends July 24. In this appears the printed copy of the Declaration. The next begins with entry under date of May 14 (continuing the record of that day, begun in the preceding volume), and the last Aug. 6, 1776. In that the Declaration appears as a regular and continuous entry, and is in the same handwriting as the rest of the Journal. The third Journal is the "Secret Domestic Journal," which contains no entry between June 24 and July 8, 1776.

Taking your queries as they come in your letter, I may say,—

1st. The enclosure gives an idea of the only printed copy of the Declaration inserted in any manuscript Journal.

2d. As will be seen, the printed names of Hancock and of Thomson are the only names appearing attached to it in *any* form.

3d. It will be seen, also, that the names of the States do not appear.

4th. The words, "The foregoing declaration," etc. (*vide* printed Journal, vol. ii. p. 245), have not been found in the Journals, neither in the manuscript copy of the Declaration nor in the printed half-sheet. They (the words above quoted) appear in the printed Journals only.

5th. Neither of the Public Journals nor the Secret Journal contains any written names to the Declaration.

Enclosure marked No. 1 is to represent the printed halfsheet. That marked No. 2 is in a manner a comparison of the entries in the two Public Journals of so much of the minutes under the 4th of July as relates to the Declaration, with the exception of that part relating to copies being sent to the several States, etc. The copying ink denotes the entries as in the Journal containing the printed half-sheet; the red ink shows them as appearing in the Journal containing the Declaration in manuscript: that is, the words in red ink appear in the Journal containing the Declaration in manuscript in addition to those in the former, while words in red brackets do not appear therein.

I am, sir, very obediently yours,

S. M. HAMILTON.

MELLEN CHAMBERLAIN, Esq., etc.

The printed page not conveniently allowing the exhibition, by type or photography, of Mr. Hamilton's enclosures, they may be described as follows: No. 1 is a folded sheet of paper designed to represent the size and form of the manuscript Journal which contains a printed copy of the Declaration, attached by wafers. The size of the sheet, when folded, is 8 by 12½ inches. On the *verso* of the first

the events of July 4, and all include the Declaration of Independence in some one or more of its stages. They are all

leaf the writing covers the upper half of the page, the lower half being left blank, apparently to receive by attachment the printed broadside of the Declaration now found there. This copy is twice folded, so as to adapt it to the page of the Journal. The printed matter measures $11\frac{1}{2}$ by $17\frac{1}{4}$ inches. Its authentication is in print and as follows:—

Signed by ORDER and in BEHALF of the CONGRESS

JOHN HANCOCK, PRESIDENT

ATTEST

CHARLES THOMSON, SECRETARY

The imprint is: "PHILADELPHIA: PRINTED BY JOHN DUNLAP." Above this printed copy of the Declaration, and forming part of the manuscript Journal which begins with May 25 and ends July 24, 1776, are the following entries, under date of July 4, 1776:—

"Agreeable to the order of the day the Congress resolved itself into a committee of the whole to take into their further consideration the declaration

"The president resumed the chair

"Mr Harrison reported that the committee of the whole Congress have agreed to a Declaration which he delivered in

"The Declaration being again read was agreed to as follows"

[Here the printed Declaration is attached by wafers.]

On the next page is the following:—

"Ordered That the declaration be authenticated & printed

"That the committee appointed to prepare the declaration superintend & correct the press."

This is the true Journal of Congress for the 4th of July, omitting the order respecting its transmission, etc.

Now compare this with the spurious printed Journal, and the falsity of the latter clearly appears. The printed Journal reads:—

"The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members."

Then follow fifty-five names of gentlemen, many of whom were not members of Congress at that time.

The other copy of the manuscript Journal is as follows, so far as it differs from the first copy; and, as will be seen, the differences are merely verbal. This is found in enclosure No. 2.

[Journal entirely in Manuscript, with the Declaration in the same Handwriting, from May 14 to Aug. 6, 1776.

So much of the minutes under 4th July as relates to the Declaration.]

Agreeable to the order of the day the Congress resolved itself into a committee of the whole to take into their further consideration the declaration and after some time

at variance with the printed Public Journal, though agreeing with each other in all essential particulars. In neither of them

The president resumed the chair &

Mr Harrison reported that the committee have agreed to a declaration, which *they desired him to report*

The declaration being read was agreed to as follows.

A Declaration by the Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

[The italicized words do not appear in the Journal to which is attached the printed copy of the Declaration.]

Mr. Dwight has placed me under additional obligations by the following letter, which throws much light upon the Journals of the Old Congress; and it is matter of regret that I am unable to present in this connection several valuable enclosures which he caused to be prepared.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, Dec. 23, 1884.

As to the several Journals: Charles Thomson, as you know, was the "perpetual Secretary" of the Continental Congress; and, from all I can gather, he was a man of the strictest probity, and was most conscientious in the discharge of his important trusts. It would be interesting to discover how much influence he exerted in the first councils. I am confident it was considerable. To him we owe the preservation of all the records of the Continental Congress, — not only the Journals, but all those fragments now so precious, *e.g.*, the original motions, the reports of committees, the small odds and ends, which are the small bones of history. They are all in this room, and at my elbow as I write. One of them, for instance, is the original of Lee's motion reproduced, but without proper explanation, by Force, in the "American Archives." You allude to it.

The Journals of Congress are, with some very few exceptions, entirely in the handwriting of Thomson. He seems to have been present at every session. The series of the archives of the Congress very properly begins with what he termed the "Rough Journal," beginning with the proceedings of Sept. 5, 1774, and ended with the entry of March 2, 1789, and was probably written while Congress was sitting, the entries being made directly after each vote was taken. It is contained in thirty-nine small foolscap folio volumes. The second of the series is a fair copy of the "Rough Journal," from Sept. 5, 1775, to Jan. 20, 1779, — in ten volumes folio. From this copy, it is stated in a record in the Bureau, "the Journals were printed; and such portions as were deemed secret were marked or crossed by a committee of Congress, — not to be transcribed." In this he has amplified some entries, and given more care to the style and composition of his sentences.

This explanation will account for the "two Public Journals." The "Rough Journal" should be regarded as the standard. No. 3 of the series of archives is the "Secret Domestic Journal," comprising entries from May 10, 1775, to Oct. 26, 1787; the fourth number is a Secret Journal, foreign and domestic, comprising entries from Oct. 18, 1780, to March 29, 1786 (the foregoing two numbers form two volumes). No. 5 is in three volumes, and is called "Secret Journal of Foreign Affairs," Nov. 29, 1775, to Sept. 16, 1788. No. 6 is in three volumes, and is designated "An imperfect Secret Journal;" it contains entries made from the Journal of Congress, Sept. 17, 1776, to Sept. 16, 1788. No. 7 is a small quarto volume, containing but few entries, called the "More Secret Journal." No. 8 is

is found an order for the subscription of the Declaration, July 4, nor any copy or account of a declaration so signed,

a folio, secret Journal A, 1776-1783; the contents of this volume appear to be merely minutes of proceedings, which were afterwards entered on the Public Journals. (This volume does not contain any record of July 4, 1776, or any reference to the signing of the Declaration.) The foregoing will afford you, I trust, a sufficiently just idea of these invaluable records.

The copy for the first edition of the Journals was probably prepared by Charles Thomson; but he was not responsible for the matter printed therein, as he distinctly states on the fly-leaf of the first volume of the fair copy (No. 2 of the series), that the selection was made by a Committee of Congress. The responsibility for the introduction of the names of the signers at the close of the Declaration cannot now be determined. It is entirely reasonable to suppose, however, that there was no intention to mislead; but that, as the names appeared in no other printed form, they were inserted for the information of the public. The Secret Journals were naturally not then suited to publication. To be sure, we must acknowledge that the entry of the record of engrossing and signing on the Secret rather than on the Public Journal, indicates that there existed some reason for considering these acts as of a confidential character.

The Journals, it must be remembered, were not the accounts of an individual, but were the accepted records of Congress; that then, as now, each day's proceedings were read to that body before they obtained the authority necessary for their preservation. I dwell upon this in order that you may not attribute the discrepancies between the originals and the printed journals to the carelessness of a clerk or of the Secretary. In my opinion, the responsibility rests with Congress alone.

That part of the Journal of 1776 as printed by Peter Force in the "American Archives" appears to me, from a hasty comparison, to be a mongrel, made up primarily from the first printed edition of 1777, corrected in some few particulars by the copy from which that edition was printed (No. 2 of the series described above), and punctuated and capitalized to suit his own fancy. He has in the punctuation and capitalization altered both the manuscript and printed versions. The matter he appended as notes, and which seem as much a part of the original record as the caption and names of the signers in the printed Journal of 1777, was taken from a variety of sources in the Archives, to which he, of course, had access. Mr. Sparks offended also, and was summarily criticised, for similar changes of the originals he printed.

With the original of Madison's "Journal of the Debates in the Constitutional Convention" we have the autograph notes written out by Jefferson for Madison, concerning the debates on the Declaration, which Mr. Gilpin has carefully printed in the "Papers of James Madison" (vol. i. pp. 9-39). It might be profitable to compare that version with the portions of the same printed in vol. i. of the Writings of Jefferson, and in vol. i. of Elliot's Debates.

In view of the fact that the Secret Journal containing the record of July 19 and August 2 was published in 1821, it seems to me very strange that the recollections of Jefferson and others should have been preferred to that veritable official account of the signing.

I am very incredulous as to the existence of a signed copy of the Declaration prior to the engrossed copy. We have the veritable first draught in the writing of Jefferson, and the remains of the copy engrossed and signed on parchment alluded to in the Secret Journal entry of July 19. Had there been another

nor any reference to such a paper. On the other hand, in one of them, which is the same as is given in the Proceedings in Force's "Archives," is pasted a printed copy of the Declaration, authenticated by the signatures of Hancock and Thomson, agreeably to the order of Congress, and is doubtless one of the copies printed on the night of the 4th or morning of the 5th of July. Had the printed Public Journal followed this manuscript, which conforms to and explains all extrinsic facts appertaining to the Declaration, all subsequent misapprehension would have been avoided. Governor McKean had special reasons for investigating the matter at an early date. He was present on the 4th, and voted for the Declaration; but inasmuch as it was not signed on that day, as he asserted, his name did not appear on the Journal, nor on the copy engrossed on parchment and signed August 2, since at that time he was away from Philadelphia, with the army. Some time later — Bancroft says, in 1781 — he was allowed to affix his signature to the engrossed copy, where it now appears. His signing in 1781 did not affect the *Journal* of July 4, 1776, as Jefferson seems to have supposed would be the case with Thornton, and the New York and Pennsylvania members, who were likewise absent July 4. McKean's name does not appear among the

bearing the signatures of the delegates, it is fair to suppose that the same care for its preservation would have been exercised as that to which we owe the other records and documents. It would not have invalidated the second copy. The actual signing of such a preliminary copy would have added no more strength to the action of Congress in adopting the Declaration than the entry on the Journal of that action, which was and is now a conclusive and binding record. It was not signed on the Journal; such a signing would have been a very irregular proceeding. It seems to me that a special direction to the President of Congress and to the Secretary to authenticate the copies sent out by order of Congress was not deemed necessary; such an authentication was incident to the duties of their respective offices. The copies so sent out bear, not written, but printed signatures.

Of that first printed broadside we have the copy wafered in the Journal, and another among the papers of Washington, which he read, or caused to be read, to the army, as mentioned in General Orders of July 9, 1776.

As you have clearly demonstrated, but for the insertion of the names in the first printed Journal so as to appear a part of the record of the 4th July, all this mystification could not have occurred. But I repeat that the insertion is not to be regarded as an intention to mislead, but to enlighten, the public; and that it is so printed is due to inadvertence.

Believe me to be, my dear sir,
Very sincerely yours,

THEODORE F. DWIGHT,
Chief of Bureau of Rolls and Library.

signers of the Declaration of Independence, in the Journal, printed in 1777, nor in the edition of 1800. It is given in that of 1823, and possibly in some of an earlier date, which I have not seen. Now, at any time after 1781, if the Declaration were printed from the engrossed copy, it would include McKean's signature; but if from the printed Journal of July 4, his signature would not be found. It was just this discrepancy between copies that led to an investigation. In the letter already quoted from, Governor McKean says: "In the manuscript Journal Mr. Pickering, then Secretary of State, and myself saw a *printed half-sheet* of paper, with the names of the members afterwards in the printed Journals stitched in;" and in another letter,¹ June 17, 1817, he says that neither the manuscript of the Public Journal nor that of the Secret Journal has any written names annexed to the Declaration. In this statement he is undoubtedly correct; but apparently he has confounded, in the lapse of years and by the loss of memory, the printed copy authenticated by Hancock and Thomson, which is wafered to the manuscript Journal, with a copy bearing signatures, which does not now appear. Trusting to this statement of Governor McKean respecting the copy of the Declaration, with the signatures of the signers, stitched into the manuscript Journal, I had supposed, until I received Mr. Hamilton's letter, that the falsification was in the record; but it now appears that it is in the printed Journal.

As has been said, had the Public Journal, as we have it, been printed from the manuscript Journal, as it stands to-day, with the printed Declaration omitting the authenticating signatures of Hancock and Thomson, we should have a narrative of the proceedings on the 4th precisely as they occurred. But, unfortunately, it was not so printed. Published as it was, and as we have it, the Journal is doubtless erroneous and misleading; and though, at this late day, we may be unable to divine all the reasons which prompted the course that was pursued, there is no evidence of a design to falsify the record. When "the committee appointed to superintend the publication of the Journals" were empowered and instructed, by a resolve of Sept. 26, 1776, to employ Robert Aitkin "to reprint the

¹ Portfolio, September, 1817, p. 246.

said Journals from the beginning, with all possible expedition, and *continue to print the same*,"¹ Charles Thomson probably furnished him with a copy of the proceedings of the 4th July, and their authority did not extend to the Secret Journal, in which alone was entered the resolution of July 19, for the engrossment of the Declaration on parchment, and the subsequent signing thereof, August 2. But when they furnished copy for the 4th of July, they appended to the Declaration the following statement: "The foregoing declaration was, by order of Congress, engrossed, and signed by the following members." We infer, and have a right to infer, that the engrossment and signing were on July 4; but the printed Journal so affirms only by implication. All the facts stated were true at the time of their statement, some time subsequent to September 26. The error consists in throwing back to July 4 the order for engrossment, of July 19, and the signing, of August 2. Any more specific statement of these later matters would have been a breach of the resolution of secrecy, which was repealed, and then only virtually, by a resolve, fifty years afterwards, to print these Secret Journals. The veil of secrecy which rested on the transactions of July 19 and August 2 undoubtedly had a tendency to refer the events of those days to July 4. Evidently Mr. Jefferson, one of the most intelligent and active participators in these events of July 19 and August 2, was surprised when they were recalled to his notice, in 1822, by the Secret Journal, which had then been published for the first time. Apparently, and not without reason, under these circumstances of secrecy, every transaction relating to the Declaration of Independence had been referred, both by Jefferson and John Adams, to the 4th of July. For more than six months Congress had withheld the names of those signing the Declaration. This may have been from prudential considerations. Unless the Declaration was made good by arms, every party signing it might have been held personally responsible for an overt act of treason. Whether this would have been the case in respect to Hancock and Thomson, who were not acting in any personal capacity, and possibly even in opposition to their own convictions, in accordance with an express direction of Congress, may be a matter of question. But whatever may

¹ Journal, vol. ii. p. 391.

have been their reasons, there is no doubt as to the fact that Congress not only sat with closed doors, and pledged their members to secrecy,¹ but withheld even from its Secret Journals some of its most important proceedings. The fact has already been stated, in regard to this very matter of independence, that Congress had deemed it imprudent to extend on its Journals Lee's resolutions on which the battle was fought; and had they not been preserved on the files, we should never have known their authentic form from any public record.²

Such are the facts respecting the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and the errors in the printed Journals recording the same.³

It is to be regretted that doubt should rest upon transactions, and the records of transactions, which are connected with an event so important in the history of a nation as the declaration of its independence. The printed Journal, so far as relates

¹ A fac-simile of the Resolution of Secrecy of Nov. 9, 1775, may be found in *American Archives*, vol. iii. 4th ser. p. 1916.

² See fac-simile of these resolutions. *Ibid.*, vol. vi. 4th ser. p. 1700.

³ In the foregoing paper it has been my purpose to discuss a single question: Was the Declaration of Independence signed July 4 by the members of Congress? Had my aim been more popular, I should have drawn, for more interesting particulars, upon the authorities cited in Winsor's "Handbook of the American Revolution," p. 103 *et seq.*, and Poole's "Index," p. 339, title "Declaration of Independence."

The reader who has followed me in the foregoing paper may ask why neither Force, Webster, Bancroft, nor Winthrop has explained the matter, instead of each resting upon his own authority in opposition to the express statements of Jefferson and Adams, who have the support of the Journal. The answer, except so far as Force is concerned, is obvious: that neither the observance of proportion in a general history, nor the limits of a 4th of July oration will allow of minute and tedious explanations. But with respect to Force, the case is different. The limits of his monograph on the Declaration were not restricted. He was brought face to face with the question. He understood it better than any other man, and better than any other he could have explained the difficulty had he chosen to do so. He did not so choose. The trouble with him was, that his pamphlet was controversial. It was an attack on that part of Lord Mahon's "History of England," in which he gives an account of the Declaration of Independence. Following Jefferson and the printed Journals of Congress, Lord Mahon had said: "The Declaration of Independence, appearing the act of the people, was finally adopted and signed by every member present at the time, except only Dickinson. This was on the 4th of July." — *History of England*, vol. vi. p. 98. Force's curt answer to this is as follows: "The Declaration was not 'signed by every member present on the 4th of July,' except Mr. Dickinson." — *FORCE's Declaration of Independence*, p. 63. Thus he made a point against Lord Mahon on the score of accuracy. True, Force knew how, and by what authority, his lordship was misled. He could have given the explanation which would have relieved the historian; but that was not his purpose.

to what took place on the 4th of July, 1776, is clearly untrustworthy; and one of the original manuscript journals is not altogether accurate. When the record was extended on that Journal, by wafering to a page apparently left blank for the purpose, the printed copy of the Declaration of Independence authenticated by the signatures of Hancock and Thomson, it was made to assert facts as of the 4th of July which actually occurred on the 5th. The authentication and the printing of the Declaration were ordered on the 4th as something to be done later; and should not have been entered as something done on that day, as the Journal affirms. Nor is this unfortunate error confined to the records. The engrossed copy of the Declaration which was signed on the 2d of August is made to say, in substance, that all the names attached to it were there subscribed, on the 4th of July; and there is nothing on the instrument to indicate that any signatures were added on the 2d of August, and even of a date so late as 1781, when McKean signed it.

These errors are the more to be regretted, since they are irremediable. They must stand on the record for all time. The Journals, in no new edition, will be changed so as to conform to the truth; and should they be so changed they would lose their authority as the Journals of Congress. But though the record must stand, and the engrossed copy and all its fac-similes continue to assert that it was signed July 4, there can be no objection to the reconstruction of these documents, as matters of history, so that they shall conform to the truth.

The several entries on the Journal which relate to the Declaration of Independence should read as follows:—

“July 4, 1776. The Declaration being read, was agreed to, as follows: [Here should appear the Declaration without any signatures, or authentication, as is the case with one of the manuscript Journals.]

“*Ordered*, That the Declaration be authenticated and printed. That the committee appointed to prepare the Declaration superintend and correct the press, etc.

“July 19. *Resolved*, That the Declaration passed on the 4th be fairly engrossed on parchment, with the title, etc.; and that the same, when engrossed, be signed by every member of Congress.

“Aug. 2. The Declaration agreed to on the 4th July, being engrossed and compared at the table, was signed by the members, agreeably to the resolution of July 19.

"Nov. 4. The Hon. Matthew Thornton, Esq., a delegate from New Hampshire, attended, and produced his credentials.

"*Ordered*, That Mr. Thornton be directed, agreeably to the resolve passed July 19, to affix his signature to the engrossed copy of the Declaration, *with the date of his subscription*.

January 18, 1777. *Ordered*, That an authentic copy of the Declaration of Independence, with the names of the members of Congress subscribing the same, be sent to each of the United States, and they be desired to have the same put upon record.

"—, 1781. Whereas it has been made to appear to this present Congress that the Hon. Thomas McKean was a member of Congress from Delaware in the year 1776, and that, on the 4th July of that year, he was present and voted for the Declaration of Independence, but being absent with the army at the time of the general subscription of that instrument on the 2d of August: therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the said Hon. Thomas McKean be allowed to affix his signature to the aforesaid Declaration, he adding thereto the date of such subscription."

Such was the course pursued by McKean and other post-signers of the Articles of Confederation, which were agreed to by Congress, July 9, 1778. McKean's name is signed as follows: "Tho. M^cKean, Feb. 12, 1779."

With the foregoing changes and additions the Journal of Congress would conform to the real transactions respecting the Declaration of Independence.

The engrossed copy reads as follows: "In Congress, July 4, 1776. THE UNANIMOUS DECLARATION of the thirteen united STATES OF AMERICA." After the Declaration follow the signatures. They should have been preceded by some such recital as the following: "The foregoing Declaration having been agreed to on July 4, by the delegates of the thirteen united colonies, in Congress assembled, and the same having been engrossed, is now subscribed, agreeably to a resolution passed July 19, by the members of Congress present this 2d day of August, 1776."

Independence was announced to the world July 4, 1776. That is glory enough for the most insatiate of days. It needs not the honors of the 2d of July nor those of the 2d of August. On the former of these days, when Lee's resolution, "that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; and that all political connection between

them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, dissolved," — when this resolution was agreed to by the Congress on the 2d of July, the battle had been fought and the victory won. Two days later came the 4th, which, like all its successors, was less the occasion of a battle than of a triumph. What was done on the 2d of July realized the ardent wishes of the patriotic party in thirteen colonies. Its consummated act was a notable achievement of advocacy; and the great orator fondly hoped that it would be celebrated to the remotest times.¹ But it is otherwise. The glory of the act is overshadowed by the glory of its annunciation.

The Declaration of Independence, and the true place of its

¹ John Adams, writing to Mrs. Adams from Philadelphia, 3d July, 1776, said: "Yesterday the greatest question was decided, which ever was debated in America, and a greater, perhaps, never was nor will be decided among men. A resolution was passed without one dissenting colony, 'that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States,' etc. You will see in a few days a Declaration setting forth the causes which have impelled us to this mighty revolution. . . . The second day of July, 1776, will be the most memorable epocha in the history of America. . . . It ought to be commemorated, as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty," etc. — *Works*, vol. ix. p. 417. But it was to be otherwise. The second day of July has altogether passed from the memory of men. In fifty years from that time the editor of Niles's "Weekly Register," shortly after the death of Adams and Jefferson in 1826, quoting the above letter, changed its date from the 3d to the 5th of July, and printed the passage, "the second day of July, 1776," as follows: "the Fourth of July, 1776, will be a memorable epoch in this history of America!"

Even so careful a writer as Mr. Webster fell, in his later life, into the same error. From the accuracy of his account of the authentication of the Declaration of Independence, it is evident that he had examined all that had been published on that subject before 1826. Nothing of value has since been added to his statement, while some of the later glosses could well be spared. — *Works*, vol. i. p. 129. But he did not undertake to explain how the confusion arose: perhaps he did not even know, since, when he wrote the eulogy on Adams and Jefferson, he was far away from the original Journals, an inspection of which alone discloses the source of the error. In this eulogy he has given two supposititious speeches on the resolution, July 2. That these speeches were on the resolution, and not on the Declaration, is evident from the opening sentence, "Let us pause! This step, once taken, cannot be retraced. This *resolution*, once passed, will cut off all hope of reconciliation." — *Works*, vol. i. p. 132. Notwithstanding this, Mr. Webster, writing, in 1846, to one who had inquired respecting the authenticity of the speech attributed to John Adams, said: "The day after the *Declaration* was made, Mr. Adams, in writing to a friend, declared the event to be one which 'ought to be commemorated, as the day of deliverance, by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty.'" — *Works*, vol. i. p. 150. It is needless to add that Adams's letter was written one day before the Declaration, instead of the day after, and referred to the Resolution of Independence of July 2, and not to the Declaration of July 4. For some account of the origin of the change of the date of John Adams's letter, see "Letters Addressed to his Wife," vol. i. p. 128, note.

author in the political history of the Revolution, are interesting themes. During the preparation of this paper my own mind has been drawn to them, and at some future time I may have a word to say upon them.

Mr. DEANE presented from Mrs. Lucia Alexander, of Florence, formerly of Boston, two samplers wrought by the sister and niece of Governor Hutchinson, and brought from Italy by Mrs. Isabella James, of Cambridge.

William G. Russell, LL.D., and Edward J. Lowell, A.M., both of Boston, were elected Resident Members of the Society.

Dr. GREEN presented the following paper:—

An insurrection, known as Shays's Rebellion, broke out in Massachusetts during the autumn of 1786, and threatened at one time the most serious consequences. The causes which led to it were various and complicated. The disaffection was confined to certain counties, and in Middlesex restricted to the neighborhood of Groton. Many of the insurgents had served in the army during the Revolution, and left an honorable record. The chief conspirator was Daniel Shays, who had fought at Bunker Hill, and later in the war had worked his way up to a captaincy. It was their aim to redress certain grievances which bore heavily on the people, but they had not as yet learned the lesson of doing it through law and order. Brought up in the use of arms, they had been taught to remedy political evils by a resort to force.

During the Revolutionary period heavy debts had been incurred, and taxes were unusually oppressive. These and other causes gave rise to the discontent which culminated in the rebellion. Many a farmer had sold his home to pay his notes, and the people were poor. Often the last cow or the last acre of land was taken to satisfy the money-lender, and distress was well-nigh universal. Northern Middlesex appears to have had more than its share of these persecutions, and this may explain why the dissatisfaction in that section was more general than elsewhere. The Rev. Grindall Reynolds, of Concord, who a few years ago investigated the subject very thoroughly, informs me that, in 1784 and the two succeeding years, every fourth man in Groton, if not every third, was subjected to one, two, three, or a dozen suits for

debt. Hardships like these would surely produce a feeling of resentment in any community. Mr. Reynolds gives me the following facts, gathered from manuscripts among the State Archives, which show that the uprising in Middlesex was due to four or five towns only. When the oath of allegiance was administered to those who had taken part in the mobs, there were 107 from Groton who took it, 67 from Townsend, 62 from Shirley, 39 from Pepperell, 10 from Westford, 3 from Ashby; while there was only one each from Framingham and Chelmsford, and none from the other thirty-three towns in the county.

"The first mutterings of discontent were heard in 1784, when Groton and Shirley appointed delegates to meet with other towns," says Mr. Reynolds, in Drake's "History of Middlesex County" (vol. i. p. 392); but beyond this I find no record to show what was then done, or even whether the convention was held. Two years later, another attempt was made to give form and shape to the spirit of dissatisfaction at that time prevalent in northern Middlesex. Unfortunately, a majority of the voters in Groton were in sympathy with this movement; and they petitioned the selectmen to call a town-meeting, and dictated the articles to be considered. The selectmen, though not approving of the measures, complied with the request, and issued the following warrant, as appears from the town records:—

June 1786.

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, MIDDLESEX SS.

To Joseph Moors Esq: one of the Constables of the Town of Groton
in said County Greeting

You are hereby required to Notify & warn the freeholders & other Inhabitants of the said Town Qualified by Law to vote in Town affairs (as are named on the list hereunto annexed,) to assemble and meet at the publick meeting house in said Town on Tuesday next [June 27], Nine o'clock before noon, in Consequence of the following request Signed by Sixty Eight persons and to act on the Several articles therein contained, which request is as followeth viz

To the Gentlemen Selectmen of the Town of Groton, we the Lawful & legal voters of said Town Humbly request that a Town meeting may be called as Soon as possible and Insert the following articles in your Warrent Viz.

First, to Choose a moderator to regulate s^d meeting.

2^{ly} To Choose a man Suitable to take a Copy of the Votes in s^d meeting.

3^{ly} To Choose a Committee to Correspond with the other Committees of any Towns in this Commonwealth Relative to our publick Grievances and that s^d Committees Draw up a Petition to lay before the General Court for a redress of the same.

4^{ly} to See if the Town will Give s^d Com^{tee} Instructions relative to their proceedings.

5^{ly} To See if the Town will Vote that the General Court be removed out of Boston.

6^{ly} To See if the Town will Vote not to have any Inferior Court

7^{ly} To See if the Town will Vote not to have more than one attorney in a County to Draw writs & that he is paid the Same as the States attorney.

8^{ly} To See if the Town will Vote that there be a stop put to all Law Suits of a Civil nature untill there is a Greater Circulation of money than there is at present

9^{ly} to see if the Town will Vote that there be a bank of paper money made sufficient to pay our foreign Debts and to chose a committee to Receive the produce of our land at a Reasonable price in Exchange for s^d money and export the same to foreign Parts for money & Bills of Exchange or other Articles Equal to the same that will Discharge s^d Debts and also another Bank to pay our Domestick Debts.

10^{ly} To see if the Town will Vote that the S^d paper money be Received in all payments Equal to Gold & Silver and he that Refuses to Take the same shall Loose his Debt.

11^{ly} To see if the Town will Vote that all Bonds and notes or other Debts be Discharged by them that they were first Contracted with or given to or their Heirs &c and that S^d Creditors shall make Discharge of s^d Debts if a lawfull tender be made.

12^{ly} To see if the Town will Vote that there Shall be no Distress made by any Constable Sheriff for Rates or other Debts untill there is a greater Circulation of money then at present.

13^{ly} to see if the Vote that the First holders of publick Securities shall draw their full sum & interest and all those that have purchased s^d Securities Shall give in on oath what they gave for the same and Shall Receive no more of the publick Treasurer Including Interest.

14^{ly} To see if the Town will Vote to open our Ports to all nations that a free trade may commence to the Good of the Community at large.

15^{ly} To see if the Town will Vote to Chose a Committee of safety to see that there is no more Infringements made on our Injured Rights and prevelidges — and act [on] any thing Relative to the above Articles or any other things which may be Necessary for the good of the Publick at Large.

Benj ^a Page	Peletiah Russell	David Woods
Eph ^m Ward	Thomas Farwell	John Woods
Stephen Munroe	Richard Sawtell	Benj ^a Hazen
Jabez Holden	Samuel Kemp Jr.	Jason Williams
Eben Tarbell	Ephraim Kemp	Daniel Williams
John Moors	Amos Adams	Jacob Williams
Amos Stone	Caleb Blood	Shattuck Blood
John Park	Benj ^a Tarbell	David Blodget
Eben ^r Farnsworth	Sam ^l Hemenway	James Bennet
Jonas Stone	Zech ^t Fitch	Isaac Lakin
Jon ^a Stone	James Shiple	Sam ^l Hartwell
Asa Stone	Joseph Shed	John ^{his} × Lawrance
Thomas Hubbard	Oliver Fletcher	^{mark}
Jon ^a Lawrence	Josiah Hobart	John Gragg
Robert Ames	Oliver Parker	Job Shattuck
Amos Ames	Royal Blood	Job Shattuck Jr.
Oliver Shed	Phinehas Parker	Benj ^a Lawrance
John Fiske	Jon ^a Worster	Samuel Gragg
Asahel Wyman	Ephraim Nutting	Jacob Lakin Parker
Joh Sartell	James Wood	Jacob Gragg
Jonathan Fiske	Nath ^l Sartell	Oliver Blood
Amos Lawrence	Jacob Patch	Levi Kemp
Enoch Cook	Sam ^l Chamberlin	Timothy Woods

And you are to make return of this Warrant with your doings therein to the Town Clerk of said Town or to some one of the Selectmen of the s^d Town by Tuesday next [June 27,] at Eight o Clock beforenoon hereof you will not fail at the peril of the Law. Given under my hand & seal this 24th day of June A. D. 1786.

By order of the Selectmen of said Town.

ISAAC FARNSWORTH Town Clerk

These several articles were referred to a committee, chosen at the meeting, consisting of Dr. Benjamin Morse, Captain Job Shattuck, Ensign Moses Childs, Captain Asa Lawrence, and Captain Zechariah Fitch, to whom "Discretionary power" was given to act as they thought best. They were requested to correspond with the committees of other towns in the Commonwealth, in relation to their public grievances, and to petition the General Court for redress.

The "request" contained in the warrant shows clearly the utter want of appreciation of the true causes of their troubles, on the part of the signers, as well as the proper remedies for relief. Their political notions were crude in the extreme, and in some respects agree well with the views of those who now advocate free trade and fiat money.

Committees from Groton, Pepperell, Shirley, Townsend, and

Ashby met at Groton on June 29, 1786, two days after the town-meeting, in order to make preparations for calling a county convention. At this preliminary meeting a committee was appointed, of which Captain John Nutting, of Pepperell, was the chairman, who addressed a circular letter to the selectmen of the other towns in Middlesex County. They were invited to send delegates to a convention, to be holden at Concord, "to consult on matters of public grievances and embarrassments, and devise a remedy therefor." At Newton a town-meeting was held expressly for the purpose of considering this letter, when a very sharp and decisive answer was sent by that town to Captain Nutting, declining to take part in the affair. Extracts from the reply are found in Francis Jackson's "History of Newton" (pp. 211-213).

The county convention was afterward held at Concord, on August 23, — the immediate result of the meeting of the town committees at Groton. Its object was to consult on public grievances; and one such grievance was the Court of Common Pleas, which was to sit on the 12th of the following month. The malcontents felt a special spite against this court, sometimes called the Inferior Court, as it was the principal source of the executions by which property was sold to satisfy the demands of the tax-gatherer. The convention voted ten articles of grievance, and adopted an address to the public, which was ordered to be printed, when it adjourned to meet again on the first Tuesday of October.

Trouble was now feared, and means were taken to prevent it. But notwithstanding these measures, a mob of about a hundred men from Groton and its neighborhood, under the command of Job Shattuck, assembled at Concord, on the afternoon of September 12, in order to prevent the session of the court. They lodged that night in the court-house, and under such other temporary shelter as they could find, and on the next day took possession of the ground in front of the court-house. Strengthened by considerable accessions to their numbers, they succeeded in their aim so far as to prevent the sitting of the court; and this produced a great excitement, not only in Middlesex, but throughout the State. Flushed with success, the rioters were now determined to suppress the session of the court to be held at Cambridge on November 28, though some of them were inclined to go no further against the govern-

ment, but in this were overruled by the leaders. As the day drew near, there were unpleasant rumors of a probable collision between the authorities and the rebels, and due care was taken to avert it. The show of strength on the part of the government, and the want of discipline among the insurgents, prevented the disaster.

John Quincy Adams, then a young man in college, writes in his journal, under the date of November 27, 1786,—as quoted by the Hon. Charles Francis Adams in his Phi Beta Kappa address, at Cambridge, on June 26, 1873:—

“This evening, just before prayers, about forty horsemen arrived here, under the command of Judge [Oliver] Prescott, of Groton, in order to protect the court to-morrow from the rioters. We hear of nothing but Shays and Shattuck. Two of the most despicable characters in the community now make themselves of great consequence.” (Page 6.)

General John Brooks, afterward the Governor of the Commonwealth, writes from Medford, under the date of November 27, 1786, to Commissary-General Richard Devens, that “one hundred Volunteers are expected in this town every moment from Groton to support the Court at Cambridge tomorrow.”¹ This is, undoubtedly, an allusion to the force under Judge Prescott, who was a prominent military character in the county. He had previously held in the militia the respective commissions of major, lieutenant-colonel, colonel, brigadier-general, and major-general.

On November 27 a small party of insurgents, headed by Oliver Parker, of Groton, marched into Concord, on their way to Cambridge with the intention of suppressing the court. This movement created fresh excitement, as the Middlesex leaders had indeed promised to remain quiet, and their appearance now was quite unexpected. Job Shattuck joined them later, coming in a more secret manner. It was intended that he should have command of the party, and act with the rebel force from Worcester County; but, owing to some want of co-operation between them, their plan fell through. At this failure the ringleaders became disheartened and scattered, when most of them returned to their homes. Warrants were at once issued for the arrest of the principal offenders.

¹ Mass. Archives, vol. clxxxix. p. 35.

Executive action was based on the following communication:¹—

TO THE GOVERNOR AND COUNCIL OF MASSACHUSETTS

I hereby certify that Job Shattuck & Oliver Parker Gentlemen & Benj^a. Page Yeoman all of Groton & Nathan Smith & John Kelsey of Shirley Gentlemen, all in the County of Middlesex & Commonwealth aforesaid have been active in the late rebellion & stirring up the people to oppose Government, are therefore dangerous persons & pray a Warrant may be issued to restrain them of their personal Liberty.

OLIVER PRESCOTT.

BOSTON Nov^r 28th 1786

A company of horsemen, under the command of Colonel Benjamin Hichborn, aided by another party under Captain Henry Woods, of Pepperell, was sent from Boston to secure the subjects of the warrant.

George R. Minot, in "The History of the Insurrection in Massachusetts" (pp. 77-79), gives the following account of the affair:—

"The execution of these warrants was committed to the Sheriff of *Middlesex* [Loammi Baldwin], and others, to whose aid, a party of horse, who had voluntarily associated for the support of government, under Colonel *Benjamin Hichburn*, was ordered from *Boston*, early in the morning of [Wednesday] the 29th of *November*. They were joined by a party from *Groton*, under the command of Colonel *Henry Wood*, and the whole consisting of more than 100, proceeded immediately for *Concord*. On their arrival there, the *Groton* horse, as being best acquainted with the country, and least liable to excite an alarm from an unfamiliar appearance to the inhabitants, were despatched to secure the subjects of the warrant. These returned at night, with two prisoners, *Parker* and *Page*, but *Shattuck*, the principal leader, had taken an alarm and escaped. Under this disappointment, at midnight, in the midst of a violent snow storm, the whole party were ordered on to *Shattuck's* house in *Groton*, where they did not arrive till late in the morning. Here they found that *Shattuck* had fled to the woods. A search was immediately commenced, and a judicious pursuit discovered him to a party of a few persons, led by Colonel *Wood* himself. *Shattuck* obstinately resisted, and was not taken until he had received several wounds, one of which was exceedingly dangerous, and which he returned, though without much injury. The three principal objects of the warrant being thus apprehended, the party returned to *Boston*, on the

¹ Mass. Archives, vol. clxxxix. p. 40.

next day but one after their departure, having pervaded the country for near fifty miles. The short time in which this excursion was performed with so large a body, and the extreme severity of the weather, rendered the execution of this service as honourable to the gentlemen who subjected themselves to it, as their motives in the undertaking were commendable."

Job Shattuck lived near Wattle's Pond, in a house which he built about the year 1782, still standing, and occupied by Harrison Holmes when the map in Mr. Butler's History was made. He is supposed to have passed the night before his arrest at the house of Samuel Gragg, two miles away from his own dwelling. When the company failed to find him at his home on the morning of Thursday, November 30, twelve men, under Sampson Reed, of Boston, proceeded at once to Gragg's residence, where there was reason to think he was hiding. They learned that he had been there, but had just left; and by the tracks in a light snow which had fallen during the previous night, they traced him to the neighborhood of his own house. Here he was taken by his pursuers, after a desperate resistance, on the banks of the Nashua River, almost within sight of his dwelling. A blow from the broadsword of F. C. Varnum, of Boston, made a fearful wound in Shattuck's knee, dividing the capsular ligament.

Another account of the arrests is found in "The Massachusetts Gazette," December 5, 1786, as follows:—

"We have the pleasure of announcing to the publick the very agreeable and authentick information of the safe return of the corps of volunteer horse, under the command of Col. Hichborn, after having achieved the object of their expedition, by the capture of *Shattuck*, *Parker* and *Page*, who have been the indefatigable fomenters of sedition in the county of Middlesex.

"Too much credit cannot be given the officers and men on this occasion, who performed a long and disagreeable march, a great part of the way in the night, in a heavy snow-storm, and in a very short period.— The people every where in the country, through which they passed, so far from the opposition which the rioters threatened, cheerfully gave them every assistance that was wanted. A company of horse, under Col. Wood, of Pepperell, were particularly active, and had the honour of securing two of the prisoners before the party arrived at Groton.— Shattuck, however, had found the means of eluding their vigilance—but upon the arrival of the troop in the vicinity of his house, a second

search commenced with renewed ardour — until he was finally discovered, pursued and apprehended — though not without a sharp conflict with one of the horse, in which much personal bravery was displayed — but upon two others coming up, he was obliged to surrender. — Shattuck was badly wounded in the knee, and the gentleman immediately engaged received a slight cut on his face. — These deluded and daring violaters of the publick peace had been in arms the day before in Concord, on their way to Cambridge, to stop the Court of Common Pleas, which is now sitting unmolested in that town.

“The most absurd and contradictory stories have been circulated throughout the country; and it may be truly said, that they have supported a bad cause by the most scandalous deception, as well to their own strength, as to the views of government.

“Every body joins in giving praise to the volunteers, who have done honour to their characters, and rendered the most essential benefit to the State by this achievement.

“Groton is about 43 [33?] miles from this town, so that what with the direct course, and the chase which they had before the seizure of Shattuck, who immediately fled to the woods, upon being discovered behind a barn, many of the company must have rode near one hundred miles from Wednesday morning to Thursday evening, and were some of them nine hours on horse-back, without scarcely dismounting in that time. There was not a gun fired at the horse, in the whole expedition, though it was generally believed that Shattuck had fortified his house in order to a vigorous opposition: This, however, proved not to be the case, for he had endeavoured to abscond, after trying in vain to raise a party for his protection. — The troop went in aid of the Sheriff, by order of his Excellency, when it was found that the late amnesty of government was without effect, in reclaiming these hardened offenders.”

Captain Shattuck was carried to Boston on December 1, and committed to jail with Page and Parker, though these last two were soon afterward released on bail. Page's liberation was due, doubtless, to the following letter from Judge Oliver Prescott, one of the selectmen at that time: ¹ —

GROTON Jany. 1st 1787.

SIR M^r Benj^a Page the State Prisoner with his Wife, begs to know of your Excellency, whither he can be admitted to Bail before the sitting of the General Court; as he has a large young Family suffering by his absence. M^r Page is a man of property & Mess^{rs} Joseph

¹ Mass. Archives, vol. clxxxix. p. 57.

Allen & Jonathan Lawrence of Groton, men of property, will appear as sureties. M^r Levi Kemp the bearer, went with s^d Page on the 27th of Nov^r last, to Carry a Letter from the Malcontents, to Capt. Pratt in Bristol County, & will inform you of their Conduct in that Journey. Your Excellency will be pleased to inform M^r Kemp whither Page can be admitted to Bail, & what are the necessary requisites for that purpose.

I have the honor to be, with the most perfect Esteem,

Your Excellencies most Obedient, Hum^l Servant;

OLIVER PRESCOTT.

THE GOVERNOR.

While in confinement Shattuck was treated kindly, and had the best of medical skill. "The Massachusetts Gazette," December 12, says:—

"*Shattuck*, the state prisoner now in this town, is amply provided with all the necessaries and conveniences proper for any person labouring under such a wound, as he received in his violent and obstinate resistance to the gentlemen who apprehended him; he is constantly attended by a number of respectable gentlemen of the Faculty, and treated with all the humanity that could possibly be shewn to any person whatever."

He remained in jail more than four months, but was finally released on April 6, under bonds of £200, and allowed to return to his family. The following letter relating to his son is on file: ¹—

GROTON Jan^y 9th 1787

SIR Job Shattuck Ju^r son of Capt. Shattuck the State Prisoner, earnestly requests your Excellency^s permission to see his Father. — he hath been in Arms twice; & after his father was apprehended absconded & went into the Western Counties, but after his return came & Voluntarily took the oath of Allegiance a Certificate of which I have sent to the Secretary^s office, & believe he will be a good Subject & I desire he may be allowed to return to his Family & Business. He will give an account of his discoveries in his Journey if interrogated.

I have the honor to be with the most perfect Esteem & respect,

Your Excellency^s most Ob^t Hle S^t

OLIVER PRESCOTT.

THE GOVERNOR.

¹ Mass. Archives, vol. clxxxix. p. 71.

The following account of Shattuck's wounds is found in "The Massachusetts Gazette," January 5, 1787:—

"As the curiosity of the publick has been excited by the situation of *Job Shattuck*, now confined in the jail in this town; and as it is not improbable his real condition may have been wilfully misrepresented in different parts of the country, it is thought expedient to publish the following, which may be relied on as a true state of facts.

"About 10 o'clock in the morning of the 30th of November, he was overtaken by a party of the posse who attended the Sheriff. Being armed with a broad sword, he assaulted the party, and before he could be made a prisoner, and disarmed, he received several slight cuts in his face and hands, and a wound in the joint of his right knee, from a broad sword. His hands and face were soon healed.

"By the wound in the knee, the capsular ligament was divided in an oblique direction, on the antierour and external part. As soon as he could be brought to an house, his wounds were dressed; and as he was to be conveyed immediately to Boston, it was judged expedient to close the gaping wound by three stitches through the cellular membrane. In this state he was conveyed to town in a sleigh, the most easy mode of conveyance at this season of the year. On the first of December, he was lodged in Boston jail. Having lain a few hours in a room on the first floor, he was removed on the same day into an upper-chamber, warm and comfortable, with a good fire-place, and capable of free ventilation, a room usually appropriated for debtors, and accommodated with glass-windows, where he was provided with suitable bedding, fireing, and a faithful nurse, and every other necessary, attended by a number of the faculty of the town.

"The great degree of inflammation usually brought on by a wound on this part, and of such a nature, was in a considerable degree prevented by bleeding, cooling medicines, anodyne and sedative applications, and by keeping the limb in an easy posture, and for the first week, the wound wore as favourable an appearance as, from the nature of it, could be expected.

"A degree of pain and inflammation, however, continued, particularly on the external and upper part of the joint; and on Friday the 8th December, it was found necessary to open a sinus which had formed from the upper lip of the wound, and a little above the joint, which discharged a considerable quantity of matter. Notwithstanding this discharge, and the constant use of antiphlogistick applications, and a total abstinence from animal food, and every thing of a spirituous kind, and inflammation of all the parts about the joint continued, and did not begin to subside until Tuesday the 12th, when they became less turgid, and the wound, with the parts adjacent, assumed a more agreeable as-

pect, the matter discharged was of a good quality, the patient was in general free from pain, rested well at night, and discovered that inclination for food which proves the system to be at ease.

"The inflammation having now subsided, it was thought proper to give the bark and wine, in order to restore the strength of the patient, which had been much impaired by the fever and discharges of matter; and there was a pleasure in observing the agreeable appearance and improvement of the wound from day to day under this course. His recovery was evident, not only to the gentlemen who attended him, but was experienced by the patient, and drew from him his approbation and acknowledgment.

"Notwithstanding these promising circumstances, he was indulged, by government, in the privilege, enjoyed by every other citizen, to choose his own physician and surgeon, and, according to his own request, was delivered into the care of Mr. Kitteredge, of Tewksbury, on Wednesday the 20th; since which time, neither of the gentlemen, who had attended, have seen him, or been consulted in his case.

"[It is to be remarked, that the patient at this time acknowledged, and Mr. Kitteredge declared the wound to be in good order, and that it 'run good matter.']"

"The Massachusetts Gazette," January 26, 1787, announces that—

"A report having been circulated in the country, that Mr. Shattuck, one of the state prisoners, had died in jail, it is proper to inform the publick, that he was last evening as well as he has been for three weeks past; and that his recovery is not improbable."

In the month of May, Captain Shattuck was tried and convicted before the Supreme Judicial Court, and sentenced to be hanged on June 28; but, the day before this, a reprieve was granted to July 26; then, on the day preceding this, the execution of the sentence was again postponed to September 20, but on the 12th of that month he received a full and unconditional pardon.

Job Shattuck's life was one of large experiences. He was born on February 11, 1736, and at the early age of nineteen took part in the French War, serving through the campaign of 1755 under General Monckton in Nova Scotia; and later he was present at the battle of Bunker Hill. In the year 1776 he was lieutenant of a company that went to Boston after that town was evacuated by the British, and the next year he commanded a company raised in Groton, that marched to

Fort Ticonderoga. During the whole period of the Revolution he gave freely of his time and money to promote the popular cause.

In the autumn of 1781, Shattuck was engaged in what were then known as the Groton riots, incited by the opposition to the silver-money tax. He and sixteen other citizens of the town threatened and bullied William Nutting and Benjamin Stone, while attending to their duties as constables in collecting taxes. It was an affair that created a good deal of excitement in its day. At the trial he pleaded guilty, and was fined £10 and the cost of prosecution.

It is but just to the memory of Captain Shattuck to say that he was a member of the church and much respected by his townsmen. At the time of the rebellion he was near the middle age of life, and a man of great bodily vigor. He was the son of a respectable farmer, and himself a large landowner. Strong and athletic in person, skilled in the use of the broadsword and proud of the accomplishment, utterly insensible to fear and having a good war-record, — all these qualities, aided by his position and means, gave him great influence among his neighbors. He paid dearly for his errors, as the crutch which he used until the day of his death, January 13, 1819, would testify; and we can well afford to be charitable now to the poor misguided men who took part in that needless and wicked rebellion.

It should not be supposed, however, that the whole town of Groton sympathized with the insurrectionary proceedings, as there were many law-abiding citizens still remaining. The following extract is taken from "The Massachusetts Gazette," December 12, 1786: —

"It may serve, says a correspondent, to give information to the publick, with respect to the importance of the *mob* in Middlesex, to know, that all the independent farmers, and all the sober, thinking people in that county, discovered the highest approbation of the measures lately taken to put a stop to all future tumults there; hoping, as they declared, that they should *now* hear and suffer no more from such infamous doings, and that the neck of sedition was broken. The people of Groton provided every refreshment, for the men and horse who went out to apprehend the leaders of the mob, and refused to receive one farthing's recompence, though ample pay was urged upon them."

During the period of Shays's Rebellion Groton was one of the three towns in Middlesex County where the Court of Common Pleas used to sit, Cambridge and Concord being the other two. In the spring of 1787 its sessions were removed by an act of the Legislature, presumably on account of the part taken by the town in this uprising.

In the year 1835 there was published anonymously at Philadelphia, a work entitled "The Insurgents: An Historical Novel," in two volumes. It is based on Shays's Rebellion, and the scene is laid mainly in the Connecticut valley. In the second volume is an account of Shattuck's capture, which is given with all the freedom of a novelist's pen.

During the excitement of the rebellion Aaron Brown's pot-ash works at Groton were burned, on November 30, by some of the insurgents. Brown was one of the two constables who served the warrants against the leaders on that very day, and the feeling toward him was bitter. The establishment was situated on the south side of the Broad Meadow road, near the village, just before you come to the meadow. "The Massachusetts Gazette," December 8, says:—

"On Thursday night [November 30], last week, the Pot-Ash works belonging to Mr. Brown, of Groton, together with several tuns of Pot-Ashes, were destroyed by fire. The loss to Mr. Brown is very considerable; and we are well informed, that there is great reason to conclude it was occasioned by the malice of one or more of the insurgents belonging to Middlesex."

It appears from the General Court Records (vol. xlvii. p. 426), May 1, 1787, that Mr. Brown subsequently received some compensation for his losses. The entry is as follows:—

In the House of Representatives . . . Whereas Aaron Brown of Groton has represented to this Court, that his pot and pearl ash works were destroyed by fire, and also exhibited evidence which affords good reason to believe that the same were destroyed by some unknown and wicked incendiary, in consequence of his great exertions in the support of good Government.

And whereas it is incumbent on the Legislature of this Commonwealth, to encourage the manufacture of pot & pearl ash, as well as to provide, as far as consistently may be, that no person shall suffer injury in consequence of his exertions to support and defend the Government:—

Resolved That there be paid out of the Treasury of this Commonwealth to Aaron Brown from the money arising from the fines which are or shall be paid by persons who have been or shall be convicted of being concerned in the late rebellion, the sum of one hundred pounds, to enable him to rebuild his pot and pearl ash works — Provided notwithstanding if the said Brown shall hereafter discover the perpetrators of the aforesaid wicked act, and shall recover the damage he has sustained, he shall in that case repay the said sum of one hundred pounds, into the Treasury, taking duplicate receipts, one of which he shall lodge in the Secretary's office.

In Senate read & concurred

Approved by the Governor

The works were subsequently re-established on the same site, and the building was standing as late as 1820. Some of the old iron kettles, used in the manufacture of potash, were lying behind Major Gardner's store at a period many years later.

Mr. A. B. ELLIS introduced the following communication from Dr. Estes Howe, of Cambridge, in regard to the abode of John Hull and Samuel Sewall: —

CHARLES DEANE, Esq.

DEAR SIR, — As I said to you some time since that I thought the editors of Sewall's Diary had fallen, notwithstanding the great care with which their work has been done, into an error as to the place of residence of John Hull, I have given a considerable amount of time to the investigation of the facts, and I am satisfied that John Hull never lived at Cotton Hill, and propose to point out the proof.

Robert Hull, the father of John, arrived in Boston Nov. 7, 1635. He was admitted a freeman March 9, 1637. He had a house-lot and "great allotment" as early as December, 1636. He was one of the Antinomians who were disarmed Nov. 20, 1637. His house-lot is described in the "Book of Possessions" as "one house and garden bounded with John Hurd South, the High Street West, Job Judkin North and Gamaliel Waite East." This lot lay on the easterly side of Washington Street, formerly Newbury Street, between Summer and Bedford Streets. The lots, by the "Book of Possessions," were six in number between these two streets. Beginning at the north, the first lot was Elizabeth Purton's, afterwards Robert Noone's; second lot, Job Judkin's; third, Robert Hull's; fourth, John Hurd's; fifth, William Plantayne's, or Blanton's; sixth, Thomas Wheeler's. The lots were proximately four rods wide and sixteen rods deep.

The first four lots were bounded on the east by the garden plot of Gamaliel Waite; the sixth, Wheeler's, was bounded on "the watering place," afterwards called "Wheeler's Pond," and the street "Pond Street." This lot of Gamaliel Waite's was his garden lot; his house was on the north side of Summer Street. The garden lot is still owned in one piece, and is now covered by the stone block occupied by C. F. Hovey & Co., owned by George Gardner, Esq. The surroundings as here described become important in future memoranda.

John Hull, born Dec. 18, 1624, came over with his father, and landed Nov. 7, 1635. In December, 1646, Robert Hull made a deed of gift to John for his "love and affection, especially being now upon his marriage about the one and twentieth year of his age" (he was twenty-two, and the mistake is singular: the deed seems to be in John Hull's writing; but the date is erroneous, — in the record being 1656, while the original is 1646). The description is in these words: "My dwelling house and garden, with all the fruit trees and appurtenances, bounded north with the land of Job Judkin; on the south with land of John Hurd; on the east with Gamaliel Waite; on the north west with the highway; only reserving unto myself during my life a free and full enjoyment of it."

John Hull was married to Judith Quincy, May 11, 1647. Robert Hull died July 28, 1666, and his will was probated February, 1667.¹ With the will the deed cited above was produced and approved, having never before been recorded. The will says: "I do give to my son John Hull my part of this house which was first built and the orchard and garden with all the appurtenances to it." From this the inference seems to be strong that John had added to his father's house, and lived under the same roof with him. Ten years after his father's death, in November, 1676, he bought from Samuel Judkins, son of Job, who also joined in the deed, a house and land next northerly of his own,² "thirty-one feet in front on the Town way, thirty-three feet, eight inches at the other end abutting upon Gamaliel Waite eastward, on John Hull southward." June 30, 1683, three months before his death, he bought of Edward Rawson a lot of land on Summer Street, being the easterly end of Widow Purton's lot, one hundred feet on Summer Street and sixty feet deep, bounded easterly on Gamaliel Waite, south on Widow Prudence Morse, whose husband, Christopher, had purchased the northerly half of the Judkins lot. The Purton lot had passed to Robert Noone; from him to Theodore Atkinson,³ from Atkinson to Thomas Danforth, and from Danforth to Rawson.⁴

John Hull died, Oct. 1, 1683, leaving no will. Mrs. Hannah Sewall, being his only child, inherited the estate subject to the widow's dower;

¹ Suffolk Probate Records, vol. i. pp. 502, 503.

² Suffolk Deeds, bk. x. p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, bk. i. p. 222.

⁴ *Ibid.*, bk. xi. p. 304.

and Sewall became tenant by the curtesy, during his life, of the real estate. Sewall and his wife and the Widow Hull agreed upon a division, which was approved by the Probate Court and recorded. The part material to this inquiry is: "Judith Hull shall have and enjoy the *Mansion House* of said Mr. Hull wherein he dyed with all the land thereunto adjoining and belonging and all tenements, shop, outhousing and buildings whatsoever on any part of said land standing with a small orchard or parcel of land thereto near adjacent late purchased of Mr. Edward Rawson." The words "*Mansion House*," "wherein he dyed," seem to leave no doubt that this was John Hull's home at his death, as it had become at his marriage. The proximity of the orchard purchased from Rawson fixes the locality definitely. The division further gives the reversion of Mrs. Hull's portion and the whole remainder of the estate to Sewall and his wife, and the survivor of them for life, and the reversion to their heirs. This doubtless is the "entail" to which Sewall alluded when he refused to sell land at Cotton Hill for the King's Chapel. As a further identification of the location of the "*Mansion House*," the deed of division mentions "the dwelling house and land purchased of Robert Walker, on the other side of the street." This was conveyed to Hull, March, 1680,¹ "butted and bounded east with the Great street, south land late of Ralph Mason, west land of Hezekiah Usher, north land late of Peter Goose." This shows it to have been on the west side of Newbury Street, somewhat farther south than Hull's lot. It was the fifth original lot south from Winter Street, then called Blott's Lane. We have seen that Hull's was the third from Summer Street, then called Seven Star Lane, or the Mill Street. As these old deeds do not give any definite names to the streets, we have to follow the title down to more modern times to fix localities definitely. The title to this estate of Hull passed as follows: To Mr. and Mrs. Sewall. At Sewall's death, January, 1730, the whole estate was divided among his children and grandchildren by lot. The *Mansion House* and lot to Dr. Joseph Sewall; but Samuel Sewall 2d exchanged with Joseph, who made a deed to him of the *Mansion House* and lot described as follows: "Situate lying and being in Newbury Street in Boston aforesaid fronting thereon westerly and there measuring fifty-five feet, southerly on land of Eneas Salter in three lines there measuring one hundred and twenty-six feet and six inches, easterly on land or orchard lately enjoyed by said Samuel Sewall Esq. in his life time and there measuring fifty-five feet, northerly on *a way* fourteen feet *wide* laid out for the use of the above said *Mansion House*, the house where Michael Hambleton lived and the orchard in the rear of said houses, there measuring in two lines one hundred and thirty-one feet."² The

¹ Suffolk Deeds, bk. xii. p. 73.

² *Ibid.*, bk. xlv. pp. 117-137.

remainder of the estate, viz. the Judkins house and lot, and the orchard behind both, extending back to the Gamaliel Waite estate, fell to the heirs of Mrs. Hirst (Betty Sewall), and was also conveyed by them to Samuel Sewall 2d; thus establishing him in possession of the whole homestead.

Samuel Sewall 2d dissipated the share of the estate of his grandfather which fell to him, and became a bankrupt within ten years of his father's death; but before that happened he conveyed to his oldest son Henry the Mansion House,—"all that my brick Mansion House with the land thereto belonging."¹ The land is described in three parcels, as in the deeds to Samuel Sewall 2d, before mentioned. The rear boundary is upon land of Major Vassall, who had become owner of the Gamaliel Waite lot, on which he had erected the well-known house on Summer Street, so long the home of Samuel P. Gardner, which was removed within a few years to make room for the present granite block occupied by Hovey & Co., as before mentioned. Major Vassall built a house at Quincy almost exactly like it, which has been the home of the Adams family for a century or more.

Samuel Sewall 2d died in 1751. His son Henry retained the homestead, and at his death, in 1771, the estate passed by his will to his son Samuel, who was a loyalist and refugee. His tenant in the Judkins or Hambleton house, John McLane, was appointed agent by the Government. The estate was sold by Commissioners Samuel Henshaw and Samuel Barrett, in two portions,—the Mansion House and orchard to William and John Molineux, and the Judkins house and lot to its tenant, John McLane.² Thus, after one hundred and forty-six years' continuous possession by six different generations,—Robert Hull, John Hull, Hannah Sewall, Samuel Sewall 2d, Henry Sewall, and Samuel Sewall 3d,—the original house-lot of Robert Hull passed out of the possession of his family.

William and John Molineux sold to Jonathan Mason.³ Jan. 20, 1803, Mason conveyed to Isaiah Thomas and Ebenezer T. Andrews, the well-known publishers (Thomas & Andrews), whose shop, No. 45 Newbury Street, at the sign of *Faust's statue*, was directly opposite.⁴

Availing themselves of the fourteen-foot passage-way between the Mansion House and that on the Judkins lot, they laid out *Central Court*, and built five houses on the orchard. Subsequently Thomas sold his share to Andrews, who bought the Judkins house and lot, May 17, 1811, which had been sold by John McLane to Thomas Pons.⁵ Thus the whole Hull-Sewall estate was again united in Eben T. Andrews, who retained it during his life. At the time of his death, in 1851, it passed

¹ Suffolk Deeds, bk. lxviii. p. 261: March 14, 1739.

² *Ibid.*, bk. cxxxix. p. 153: 1781.

³ *Ibid.*, bk. cxlvi. p. 153: Dec. 21, 1784.

⁴ *Ibid.*, bk. ccvi. p. 13.

⁵ *Ibid.*, bk. clxviii. p. 224.

to his son, William T. Andrews, whose heirs still own it. I have thus, I think, fully identified the homestead of Robert Hull, and shown that John Hull lived and died there.

The part of the Cotton Hill estate first owned by Hull was conveyed to him by Seaborn Cotton in 1664.¹ Hull had then been married and living in Newbury Street eighteen years. In 1666, by the death of his father, he came into full possession of the homestead. The Cotton House and larger part of the land he acquired in 1682, May 29, only sixteen months before his death. I think it is quite clear that he never removed from the Mansion House, where he was married, lived, and died.

Where did Sewall live?

By the evidence frequently reiterated in the "Deeds" of division of his estate, he certainly "lived and died" in the Mansion House on Newbury Street. Did he ever live any part of his married life elsewhere? On this question the Diary is almost our only guide. From that I gather: He was married in the "Old Hall" in Father Hull's house. He certainly lived with Father Hull till his first child was born. The account of the severe attack of dysentery from which both Mother Hull and Hannah Sewall suffered in October, 1676, shows plainly that they were living in the same house (vol. i. pp. 22-25). See also the account of the birth of the first child; note that he and Father Hull were sitting in Hull's room when they heard the child's first cry (vol. i. p. 30): "Our house, i. e. Father Hull's." April [1st], 1677, he says, "John Sewall born at Father Hull's."

If he had removed from Father Hull's, it would certainly have been mentioned in the Diary; and if such removal ever took place, it must have been during the period covered by the lost volume of the Diary. It seems scarcely possible that any such move could have been made to Cotton Hill without some evidence of it in the remaining volumes. I have looked carefully through the three volumes without finding any evidence of it. In vol. i. p. 110, Dec. 9, 1685, two years after Hull's death, he mentions "Neighbor Gamaliel Waite;" (p. 183) July 16, 1687, was much disturbed in the night by a riot of men drinking and carousing at "Wheeler's Pond," only a few rods from the Hull Mansion House; (p. 207) Shaller's distil-house in Newbury Street burned. Sewall considered his house in danger, at which the editors wonder, as they well might, if Sewall lived at Cotton Hill; (p. 210) April 13, 1683, six months before Hull's death, "grafted a pear next J. Waite's;" J. Waite was a son of Gamaliel, and part of the estate had been conveyed to him before his father's death; (p. 331) Sept. 22, 1690, the account of Neighbor Hord's death-bed is striking: "about eleven o'clock I supposed

¹ Suffolk Deeds, bk. vi. p. 227.

to hear neighbor Mason at prayer with him just as I and my wife were going to bed." Hord's house was on the lot next south of Sewall's; it was September, and with the windows open, the voice of "neighbor Mason" could easily have been heard. Ralph Mason lived on the west side of the street, next the corner of West Street. This John Hord, or Hurd, I presume is the same man whose excommunication for incorrigible drunkenness is recorded by Hull (p. 193 of his Diary). His death-bed behavior greatly shocked Sewall, who would not attend the funeral, which self-denial must have been a cross to him (p. 332).

The catastrophe to the kitchen chimney, at which Mother Hull was greatly alarmed, seems to have determined Sewall to begin his new house at once (p. 376). The old kitchen is first removed; then the "Little Hall" is removed to Matthias Smith's: he seems to have been a neighbor in poor circumstances.

The corner-stones of the new house were laid; these give the editors much trouble, which disappears now we have the correct location of the house (p. 377). One corner was "towards Father Walker's." Robert Walker was one of the first settlers, and one of the four old men whose affidavits about the purchase from Blackstone are upon record. He was a weaver, and a very pious and worthy man, much esteemed by Sewall: witness his eulogy at the time of his death, May, 1689, four years before this time; note the distinguished guests at the funeral, notwithstanding his humble position; note that the guests assembled at Sewall's house, which shows its proximity. There seem to have been intimate relations between the families. Dame Walker was at this time keeping a dame school; Sewall's children went to it (see vol. i. p. 164). Dame Walker sent home the children, too sick to teach them (see the account of her death, Dec. 21, 1695, vol. i. pp. 417, 418); Sewall's remarks to Sam., and Sam.'s great grief). Walker's lot was the third north of West Street. As I have before shown, Sewall owned the Walker estate, it having been purchased by Hull in 1680, thirteen years before. The next stone was at the southeast corner, toward "Wheeler's Pond." This noted watering-place was not more than eight or ten rods from Sewall's southerly line, being only separated by Hurd's and part of Plantayne's, or Blanton's, lots. The next corner is "towards Fort Hill," — a considerable distance; but as Summer Street was the road to Fort Hill, and was very near, it is natural enough. The last is the northwest corner, "towards Cotton Hill." This undoubtedly is only applicable on account of the large estate Sewall had there; the indications are obvious enough, and consistent with the Newbury Street location, while utterly inexplicable as applied to a house at Cotton Hill.

Sewall had a fall in climbing about the new house, in one of the chambers "next Tilers" (vol. i. p. 388). In December, 1689, John

Hurd, son of John Hurd, conveyed to John Tyler the north half of his father's house, twenty-two feet on the street, ninety-four feet long, bounded north by Captain Sewall's land.¹ It follows that the chamber "next Tilers" was on the south side. Sewall plants trees at Wheeler's Pond (vol. i. p. 401).

June 6, 1713. There was a leak "next Salters" (vol. ii. p. 388). Eneas Salter, who is frequently mentioned in the Diary, had become possessed of the Hurd lot. In the deeds of division of Sewall's estate, the Mansion House lot is bounded on the south by land of the late Eneas Salter; the leak was therefore on the south side.

He speaks of "neighbor Hamilton" (vol. iii. p. 14). From the division deeds we learn that the Judkins house was occupied by Michael Hamilton.

Funeral of Neighbor Isaac Odlin (p. 384). John Odlin, one of the old first settlers, and signer of the Blackstone affidavit, lived on Newbury Street, nearly opposite the Adams House; this was doubtless his son. In short, every local allusion fits exactly with the Newbury Street residence. I cannot doubt that he spent the whole of his married life there, as it is certain that he died there.

Sewall was, like Hull, captain of the South Company. He appears, by the Diary, to have kept "watch and ward" at night in his turn. His companion was usually Isaac Goose; he was the son of Peter Goose, and lived nearly opposite Sewall, on Newbury Street.

Sewall's Walk with the Governor.

Many things that are troublesome to the editors in this walk become simple now that we know where Sewall's house was. First they start up "Hoar's Lane." As none of the streets had at this time definite names, such as local accident suggested seem to have been used. Newbury Street itself is called in the deeds the "Broad street," "Highway to Roxbury," "the street that leads from the Third meeting house to Roxbury." The side streets were still more indefinitely named. School Street is called, at as late a period as 1669, in a deed of Robert Right's,¹ "the street going up to Elder James Penn's" (Penn's lot was where the Albion now stands); yet the town school had been kept there since 1645. Winter Street was called "Blott's Lane," from Robert Blott who lived on the southerly corner. Summer Street was called "Seven Star Lane," "the Mill street," and "the road by Gridley's." West Street appears in this description as "Cowell's Lane."

"Hoar's Lane," I cannot doubt, was "Rawson's," afterwards "Bromfield's" Lane. Rawson, Jan. 30, 1654, acquired the estate of the old

¹ Suffolk Deeds, bk. xv. p. 80.

² *Ibid.*, bk. vi. p. 177.

Notary Public and Clerk, William Aspinwall, who had fallen into disfavor and returned to England. It consisted of about two and a half acres of land running from Washington to Tremont Street, on both sides of the lane now Bromfield Street. Here he built a house and lived. In 1669, March 17, having lived there fifteen years, he sold to William Hoar, a baker, a lot on Washington Street, bounded southerly on his neighbor Ephraim Pope, and northerly on "his lane." This was his first sale. In November, 1669, he sold to the Hon. John Pyncheon the opposite corner with his house, and in October of the next year the remainder of the land on the north side of his lane. The width of the lane is not defined, but all the deeds covenant for a free use of it. Subsequently he sold the remaining land on the south side to his son, William Rawson, Robert Noakes, J. Jepson, and the last lot near the middle, to John Pyncheon, so that in 1674 he had parted with the whole property. The lane, unlike the other cross-streets, was a purely private enterprise. Sewall's reason for calling it "Hoar's lane" was doubtless that William Hoar lived at the corner on the lot first sold by Rawson. Sewall had loaned Hoar some money on a mortgage of it immediately after Hull's death. This mortgage is mentioned by the editors, but they erroneously suppose the land to have been on the corner of School Street. As Rawson's deed to Hoar bounds him in front on the highway leading from the Third Church to Roxbury, and School Street is north of that church, the land must have been south of the Old South Church. The streets were not yet named. An order was passed, May 3, 1708, fixing the names. "The way leading from Briscoe's corner in Marlboro' street passing Justice Bromfield's into the Common, Rawson's Lane." Briscoe's corner is the corner where William Hoar lived, which he had mortgaged to Sewall in 1683, and subsequently released to him. Sewall, April 17, 1703, made a deed of gift of this property to his eldest son, Samuel, and described it as then in the "tenure and occupation of *Joseph Brisco*, baker."

The description of Newbury Street is as follows: "The street from the corner of the House in the tenure of Capt. Turphey nigh Deacon Elliot's corner leading into Town by the *house of Samuel Sewall Esq.* as far as Dr. Okes corner, Newbery street." This recognizes the residence of Sewall as the most distinguished inhabitant. Dr. Thomas Oakes, brother of President Oakes, who was Sewall's family physician (witness the *Diary passim*), bought the estate at the southwest corner of Summer and Newbury Streets, from William Rawson, son of Edward, whom I have previously shown to have been the owner.

In giving the boundaries of these streets, the initial and terminal points are almost uniformly fixed as in these cases. It seems apparent that the name of some prominent person on a corner was up to that

time the only method of describing a street. In this neighborhood, for instance, in addition to the examples I have given, West Street starts from "Cowell's corner;" Winter Street, from "Ellises corner" (Edward Ellis, "Chirurgeon," married Robert Blott's daughter, and inherited his corner, and apparently the name was changed with it). School Street starts from Widow Haugh's corner. This estate had from the first been the homestead of Atherton Haugh, and, it seems, still remained in the family.

After the passage of this order Sewall speaks of Rawson's Lane (vol. ii. p. 174). Coming through the lane, he saw Bastian, the negro, cutting an elm-tree near the Governor's coach-house. The editors suggest that this might have been at the corner of Tremont and Beacon Streets, where the Tremont House stands. It was really at the corner of Tremont and Bromfield Streets, where Horticultural Hall stands. It belonged to Sewall, who had acquired it through a mortgage from John Pynchon. The coach-house was leased to the Governor, being very conveniently situated to the rear of the Province House. It was so occupied at Sewall's death, and was sold by his heirs to Edward Bromfield, who had purchased all the land on the southerly side of the lane as far east as the Hoar lot, and built his house there, as the foregoing description of the lane in the order of the selectmen shows.

Assuming, then, that Hoar's Lane was Rawson's or Bromfield's Lane, let us continue our walk "past the Alms House," that is, up Park Street, thence down Beacon Street to the pasture afterwards bought by Sewall, and so often mentioned in the Diary as the Elm Pasture; thence by "Cowell's Lane," which doubtless was West Street, as this street in 1708 ran from "Cowell's corner" to the Common. Sewall applies the name here, as he did Hoar's to Rawson's Lane. The editors here, being led away by the "new garden," take us through a very interesting digression to the foot of Beacon Street and Blackstone's garden; but in fact the aged Governor and his young friend crossed the Common from Joy Street to West Street, and there, as they came out of the lane to the main street, they met little Sam Sewall, then about seven years old, who ran to them, telling of the death, by the hands of the butcher, of the old cow; upon which Sewall gives, as usual, an obituary notice, saying, "she has served this family ten years, nine since I came into it;" thus adding another proof that the Sewall and Hull families were one. "Then to the new Garden." This is conjectured by the editors to be at the foot of the Common. It seems to me it must have been the orchard or garden bought by Hull two years before from Edward Rawson on Summer Street next Gamaliel Waite's. It was the 10th of May, the spring work was going on, and Sewall doubtless wished to show the Governor how he was adorning it. It was to Sewall the "*New*

Garden," and therefore specially interesting. "Thence to the House, and then a little farther to the pasture by Eng's." Madett Eng's, as he signs his name to his will, had a lot and house where he lived, on the north side of Summer Street, about opposite Church Green. Sewall had a lot next east of him, and this doubtless was the place visited. The peculiar name of Eng's was a grievous stumbling-block to the clerks of his time. I find Eings, Engles, English, Ingles, Inge, Inglys, but never Eng's; Madid, Mawditt, Maudit, but never Madett. Eng's left a son and three grandsons. The real estate passed out of the family in the third generation. The name is still found in the Boston and New York Directories. Had Sewall's house been at Cotton Hill, it would have been more than "a little farther."

Thence to the governor's home. As the editors say, Governor Bradstreet's residence at that time is unknown. It was probably in a hired house, as no real estate suitable seems to have belonged to him there. He provides in his will for the payment of a quarter's rent for his widow after his death. He was taxed in 1688 in the Seventh Division or Company, with John Pynchon, William Hoar, and Peter Sargeant, who all lived on the westerly side of Marlboro' Street. Captain Sewall is always mentioned in the Eighth Company, in the assessors' lists, also in the enumeration or list of inhabitants in 1695.

In the Diary I find two passages that might be construed to indicate that Sewall lived at Cotton Hill. The first is in vol. i. p. 59: Sewall's petition for leave to build a "fore door" for "my house on Cotton Hill." This was of course to project into the street, as no permission would otherwise be needed. This is one year after Hull's death, Oct. 15, 1684. Winter was coming on; and no doubt the tenant, whoever he was, demanded the relief. Sewall had been married more than eight years, and would not have waited so long for such a necessary addition to the comfort of his house. There is nothing to show that Sewall occupied the house he owned. Again, in 1699, when the school-house was built in Scollay Square, he made vigorous protest. The town promised not to build any more buildings there, and Sewall had the measurements from the school-house put upon record. These all relate to his gateposts as far as his estate is concerned, not to any house, and obviously have no bearing upon the place of his residence. The history of the school-house is curious. In 1693 it was sold to William Scollay for £500 (\$1,666.67). In 1872 the city paid \$185,595 for the same property. It is true Scollay had added, by purchase from Jeffrey, thirty feet in length on the north; but the town had previously cut off more than that on the southerly end of the lot.

I think the evidence I have adduced is incontrovertible. I have searched carefully for it, and am sure that the editors of the Diary will be glad to have the facts pointed out

Cotton Hill.

The Cotton Hill estate does not lose its interest because neither Hull nor Sewall lived there. It is certain that John Cotton built his house there, and that Sir Henry Vane built such an addition to it as to be spoken of as part of Cotton's house; that when Vane returned to England he gave his house to Seaborn Cotton, the oldest son; that Cotton provided in his will for carrying out this bequest or gift.

Cotton's other heirs, in 1664,¹ released this house and land to Seaborn. It was the southerly part of the land, and its relations to the other part of the house may be gathered from this addendum to the deed of release, which is executed by Sarah, Increase, and Maria Mather, and John Cotton: —

“Whereas in the within written deed the bounds eastly is mentioned to be from the north side of the house east, It is agreed upon mutually by the persons interested therein that sayd bounds is only from the south side of the present standing gate upon a straight line to the north side of said house; and further it is agreed that from the north side of said house there be a straight line run down to the Front or Town street sixteen foot northward of the south side of said gate, which said strip of land is and shall be by agreement of all parties in perpetual common for the use of both parties.”

This is not very clear, but it shows that Vane's house stood back from the street, and that there was room for a sixteen-foot passage-way between it and Cotton's house, although it is called part of Cotton's house. No further aid from the “Records” can be obtained until the division of the estate among the heirs of Judith Cooper in 1758, ninety-four years afterwards. Then there were three houses upon the estate. First, the Cotton house on the north lot, which had a front on the street of seventy feet; then a passage-way of twenty feet, probably the sixteen-foot way made four feet wider. Back of this, one hundred and seventy feet up the hill, another house, by whom built is uncertain, but most likely while Judith Cooper was in possession, as there is no mention of it in the deed of division of Sewall's estate. Then upon the southerly lot in front, which was seventy-three feet wide, was still another house, which by the partition was divided by a line passing through the middle of it, making two lots, the southern thirty-three feet in front, and the northern — bounded on the passage-way — forty feet. This house was then in possession of William Vassall, to whom the whole estate was conveyed by Judith Cooper's heirs.

Was this the house built by Sir Harry Vane? If so, it had been moved southerly. When Hull bought it, ninety-four years before, the

¹ Suffolk Deeds, bk. vi. p. 233.

passage-way was laid out along the northerly side of the house; now this passage-way was forty feet from the centre line of the house, and the Cotton house was still more remote. Of course it may have been moved.

Of the use of the estate while in Sewall's possession, something may be learned from the Diary. The first mention of it is Aug. 31, 1686: "Mr. Lee views the house at Cotton Hill in order to taking it" (vol. i. p. 151). We are not informed whether he did. March 27, 1699, "Captain Tuthill desires to take the Cotton House" (vol. i. p. 494). It appears that he did so. July 25, 1699, "Between six and seven (just at sunset) I have my lady (Bellomont) up upon Cotton Hill and show her the town" (vol. i. p. 500). "Mrs. Tuthill's daughters invited my lady as came down and gave good glass of wine." So Tuthill had moved into the house. Of course, if Sewall had lived anywhere in the neighborhood, his house would have been the scene of the entertainment.

Sept. 4, 1700, "Capt. Byfield and Peter Weare accompany Sewall as witnesses to warn Mr. Gooze out of the house *on* Cotton Hill" (vol. ii. p. 22). I take this to be Captain Edward Gouge, of whom Dunton says: "He is an ingenuous and witty person. He is an old bachelor and yet as I am told a secret friend of the fair sex." This was in 1686. He was married before May, 1693, when his wife, Frances, relinquished dower in an estate he mortgaged to Elizur Holyoke, and subsequently surrendered. His widow had administration on his estate March 6, 1705. His estate was insolvent. The town records charge him, April 25, 1689, with a son by Martha Staples. Sewall mentions his death in the Diary, Jan. 26, 1705: "The poor man lived undesired and died unlamented." Gouge promised to leave in November, and probably did so.

Oct. 17, 1700. Grove Hirst and Elizabeth Sewall were married and probably went to housekeeping in the house vacated by Gouge. At any rate, after Mrs. Hirst's death, which took place July, 1716, the Diary says, Dec. 24, 1717: "Agreed with Obadiah Gore carpenter to let him the house at Cotton Hill in which Mr. Hirst lately dwelt for four and twenty pounds a year to pay quarterly. Term ten years beginning the last day of this December." This term extends to within two years of Sewall's death. But Gore died before the end of the lease, and in 1724 the widow settled the estate, and paid Sewall £15, as charged in her account, probably for rent. At the time of Sewall's death, his sons-in-law, Cooper and Gerrish, occupied the houses.

It seems to be thought that the Gardiner Greene house may have been identical with the Vane house, but it seems impossible that any one who ever saw it could credit such an idea. The house built by William Vassall, after he acquired the estate from the Cooper heirs,

was placed far back from the street, approached by a series of steps, the grounds graded into terraced gardens, and the house itself so large, roomy, and elegant, that Mr. Greene never thought any material change in it desirable, as his descendants inform us. Certainly the structure which Sir Harry built, as an addition to John Cotton's house in 1636, was not moved up the hill, one hundred and twenty-two years afterwards, after having been rented to numerous tenants, to be the mansion-house of a rich man of fashion like William Vassall. We know from contemporary history that this was always considered one of the finest estates in town. When William Vassall, like most of his race, became a refugee, the house and furniture were put in charge of Judge Oliver Wendell by the authorities. The house was rented at auction from year to year. The account rendered shows from year to year the depreciation of the Continental currency. In 1780 the rent was £2,600, which was reduced to specie £65, or forty for one. A subsequent account is at seventy for one. The furniture was removed to fit up a house for the French Ambassador, and after the end of the war was sold at auction for £980, lawful money, which, considering the prevailing poverty and that the furniture had been used as it was, shows that it must originally have been very rich and handsome. The estate, for some reason which does not appear, escaped the confiscation that befell so many others. It passed to Patrick Jeffrey; he sold the part west of Somerset Street to Asa Hammond, and the rest to Jonathan Mason, who almost at once sold to Gardiner Greene, who thus became possessed of the whole front originally granted to Cotton, and continued to hold it the remainder of his days.

What became of Sir Harry Vane's house? and John Cotton's? It seems to me clear that when Vassall acquired the property and built his fine house on it, the three old houses that encumbered its front, intercepting his prospect, were removed. Whether torn down or removed whole, they disappeared from view and from any further connection with history.

The various conveyances show that when Hull bought of Seaborn Cotton he bought one house. When the John Cotton lot was conveyed by his heirs to Nicholas Paige, it is described as "the dwelling house and ground under the same, formerly the mansion house of their late father Rev. Mr. John Cotton." Paige conveys to Hull the land, "together with all houses, tenements, new and old stables, out houses, edifices, buildings, fences &c." The next description is forty-eight years after, in the partition of Sewall's estate in 1730. Then the description is "the land at Cotton Hill with the buildings and appurtenances in tenure of William Cooper and Samuel Gerrish."

As I have said, the third house in rear of the Cotton mansion is never mentioned until the estate was divided between Judith Cooper's

heirs, and it was then immediately sold to Vassall. When Vassall sold to Jeffrey he describes the land, and adds with the "Mansion house, out houses and appurtenances." No other houses are mentioned. Jeffrey conveys to Mason, and he to Greene, land "with a dwelling house and brick stable." There is certainly, from the time that Vassall bought in 1758, no mention upon the record of either of the old houses.

Bowditch, as quoted in the Diary, points out an error into which Drake fell about an old house supposed by Drake to be Sir Harry Vane's, and shows that Drake was "within one" of it. The house in question stood almost exactly where Rogers's shoe-store has been now for almost half a century. It was a brick house, and in the last years of its existence was used for offices. The late Dr. A. A. Gould, President of the Massachusetts Medical Society, had an office there in 1833 and 1834; it then belonged to Gardiner Greene, who acquired it in 1824. It was conveyed to him¹ by the Hon Thomas L. Winthrop, trustee, under the will of Sarah Waldo. It was conveyed to her in 1791² by the Hon. James Bowdoin, Governor, as executor and trustee under the will of his father-in-law, the Hon. John Erving, and is there described as a "Messuage, land and tenement at the head of Court street, consisting of a large brick house, a barn and sundry out houses, being the *Mansion house of Hon. John Erving.*"

The lot in the "Book of Possessions" is assigned to the Rev. Daniel Maude, who shares with Philemon Pormont the honor of being the earliest school-teacher. As he removed to Dover after a few years, the property passed to Robert Howard, Notary Public, who lived there when Hull acquired the Seaborn Cotton estate. At his death and that of his wife in 1683, the property passed by will to his son Jonathan, who died, unmarried and intestate, in 1690. His brothers and sisters, of whom there were six, shared the estate; and James Leblond became the owner.

As shown above, it passed from his heirs to the Hon. John Erving. The brick house was probably built by Leblond. In his inventory the real estate is, "Brick House and wooden and land, 1713." The conveyance by his heirs to Erving, April 12, 1736, "Land at upper part of Queen street, whereon stand two Dwelling houses one of Brick the other of timber." From the appearance of age about the structure it seems probable that the brick house became the mansion-house of the Hon. John Erving, and remained without material change until its final destruction in 1835, when Cotton Hill was reduced to its present level.

It is difficult now to realize that Cotton Hill before its demolition was seventy feet at its apex above the present grade of Pemberton Square, as Bowditch tells us it was. It was so steep originally on the northerly

¹ Suffolk Deeds, bk. cexcii. p. 196.

² *Ibid.*, bk. clxxxii. p. 161.

face, that Captain Cyprian Southack (who laid out Howard Street, then called Southack's Court), was ordered by the selectmen, Oct. 19, 1732, "to secure his hill near the Valley acre by rails or otherwise that people may not be in danger." The Valley acre so frequently spoken of in the deeds perhaps received its designation from the valley between Beacon Hill and Cotton Hill, now occupied by Somerset Street; though now that the eastern hill has been laid low, and the western one much reduced in height, it does not seem appropriate to associate the word "valley" with it. Whether this hill had any springs does not appear, but in the town records on the 20th day of the fifth month, 1657, the selectmen appointed "Deacon Marshall and Ensign Hull a committee to gaine liberty from Mr. Seaborn Cotton and his Mother to bring water down from their hill to the Conduit to be erected."¹ The sources of supply to that first attempt at water-supply for Boston have always been in doubt; whether any was ever obtained from this source does not appear.

With this I conclude what I have to say of this truly historic ground.

ESTES HOWE.

Mr. C. C. SMITH announced a Memoir of the late Mr. George Dexter.

¹ Report of Record Committee, vol. ii. p. 138.



George Dexter

MEMOIR
OF
GEORGE DEXTER, A.M.
BY CHARLES C. SMITH.

GEORGE DEXTER was a member of the Historical Society for six years, and during this period he was absent from home, on account of ill health, for about a quarter of the time. But his membership was long enough to secure for him the warmest personal regard of his associates, and to enrich our Proceedings with numerous contributions marked by abundant evidence of ripe scholarship and patient industry. He had in this comparatively short time rendered important service to the Society as its Recording Secretary; and still more important and varied service in later years might have been justly anticipated from him. He was born in Ohio, in the village of Fulton, now a part of the city of Cincinnati, on the 18th of July, 1838, and was the fourth child of Edmund and Mary Ann [Dellinger] Dexter. Through his father, who was a native of Leicestershire, he was of English descent; and on his mother's side he traced his ancestry back to Germany, where his maternal grandfather was of high social rank. His school days were passed wholly in his native city; his first teacher being Miss Mary Ann Davis, of whom he cherished through life the pleasantest recollections. After leaving her school he spent a little less than a year in the academy of Mr. Joseph Herron, at that time connected with the Cincinnati College, from which he passed to the classical school under the charge of Mr. Eben S. Brooks, where he completed his preparation for college. "To Mr. Brooks and his able assistant, Dr. N. E. Soule, both graduates of Harvard," he wrote in his College Class Book, "I owe much of the fondness for classical studies which has

been the sole distinguishing mark of my college course." He entered Harvard College, without conditions, in 1854, and was graduated, with good but not high rank, in 1858. His part at Commencement was an essay on Aaron Burr. During the whole of his course he resided outside of the college yard, so that he lost some of the more intimate associations of an undergraduate's life; but he impressed all his classmates by the purity and refinement which characterized him in later years. They were "as marked in the college boy," says one of his friends in the College and in this Society, "as they have been in the Christian gentleman whom we all have held in special regard, whom they who knew him best have esteemed most deeply."¹

A month after leaving college he sailed for Europe, with the intention of spending the next winter in Berlin, after which he hoped to pass "some years in study at the various German universities and in travelling." But the attractions of home were too strong for one who was always held to family and friends by the strongest ties, and he soon changed his plans. He spent a few months in travel in Germany and Italy, and returned home in December; and in the following March he entered the Harvard Law School. He remained in the Law School until July, 1860, when he received the degree of LL.B. After graduating from the Law School he continued to live in Cambridge, as a resident graduate, until the summer of 1861, when he went to Europe with his parents, both of whom were in failing health. Not long after landing in Europe his father became so seriously ill as to require from him constant care during the remainder of their absence abroad. They all returned in July, 1862, and a week after their arrival in New York the father died. In the following September Mr. Dexter again became a resident graduate in Cambridge.

In May, 1864, in the darkest days of the civil war, in response to a call for volunteers to serve for ninety days, he enlisted as a private in the twelfth unattached company of Massachusetts Volunteer Militia, which was composed almost wholly of residents of Cambridge. The company was sent to garrison the fort at Provincetown. While in this service Mr.

¹ See the remarks by the Rev. Henry W. Foote, *ante*, p. 9.

Dexter acted as commissary and quartermaster-sergeant. During his absence he was elected secretary of his college class, and received the degree of A.M. In September, 1865, he sailed again for Europe. The winter was spent in Paris, after which he travelled in England, and returned to this country in June, 1866. On the 17th of September, 1868, he was married to Lucy Waterston, daughter of Mr. Charles Deane, and immediately afterward sailed for Europe with his wife. They returned after an absence of three months, and took up their residence in Cambridge, which had always possessed peculiar attractions for him. In September, 1869, he was appointed Tutor of Modern Languages in Harvard College, which place he resigned, in October, 1870, to become Steward. The duties of his new office did not prove altogether congenial, and he resigned it in December, 1871. He had inherited ample means, and he did not afterward engage in any remunerative employment; but he was never idle, and freely gave his services for the promotion of objects in which he took a warm personal interest.

Mr. Dexter was elected a member of the American Antiquarian Society at the April meeting in 1876. In the work of that Society, he was much interested, though absence from home and ill-health made his attendance at its semi-annual meetings somewhat irregular. To its printed Proceedings for October, 1881, he contributed a short and carefully prepared paper on "The Testimony of Fabyan's Chronicle to Hakluyt's Account of the Cabots." In November, 1877, he was unanimously elected a member of the Historical Society. This election opened to Mr. Dexter the opportunity for the best work of his life, and gave to us, in the apt phrase of Mr. Winthrop, "a model Secretary for all who may follow him." When Mr. Deane, who had filled the office of Recording Secretary with signal ability for thirteen years, was transferred, in 1877, to the Corresponding Secretaryship, the Nominating Committee found great difficulty in selecting a successor. The office was tendered to several gentlemen, who declined to undertake its duties from a feeling that more time would be required for the discharge of those duties as they had been performed by Mr. Deane, than could be given by any one actively engaged in other pursuits. It was well known to two of the members of the Committee, — the late William G. Brooks and the late

Delano A. Goddard, — and to other members of the Society with whom they consulted, that Mr. Dexter had often rendered valuable service to the Committee for publishing the Proceedings; and their thoughts naturally turned toward him as possessing all the needful qualifications. But he was not a member of the Society. In this emergency our brilliant and accomplished associate, the late Edmund Quincy, consented to take the office, only on condition, however, that he should not be asked to serve for a longer period than one year. He was accordingly elected, and entered on his duties with a zeal and energy which justified the highest expectations as to his service. But these expectations were speedily and sadly disappointed. Mr. Quincy died in a little more than a month after his election; and at the same meeting at which his death was announced, the death of another distinguished member, Mr. J. Lothrop Motley, was also announced. As soon as the rules and custom of the Society would allow, Mr. Dexter was elected to fill one of the two vacancies thus created; and at the Annual Meeting in the following April, he was elected Recording Secretary, which office he filled for a little more than five years.

Mr. Dexter did not limit himself to a prompt and in every way satisfactory performance of his duties as Secretary, and as Chairman of the Committee for publishing the Proceedings; he began at once to enrich our volumes with numerous and important communications of his own. At the meeting in February, 1878, he communicated from the original manuscript Tutor Sever's argument before the Massachusetts Council, in 1732, advocating the right of the instructors in Harvard College to a place in the Corporation, prefacing it by a short and lucid statement of the questions at issue, and of the action on them.¹ In May following, he communicated an unpublished letter of Governor Pownall to the Rev. Dr. Cooper after the recognition of American independence, with explanatory remarks. In September of the same year he presented copies of a considerable number of letters of the Rev. Dr. Andrew Eliot, written during the Revolution, accompanied by a short account of the writer, and by the necessary eluci-

¹ This communication was reprinted in a separate pamphlet for private distribution, as were several of Mr. Dexter's later communications. Nine of these reprints are in the Society's archives.

dations; and these were followed, in October, by remarks on some newly discovered letters of Columbus and Vespuccius, with translations of the letters themselves.

In September, 1879, he gave an interesting account of M. Moerenhout, whose name had been on the Corresponding Roll of the Society for more than forty years, and who had recently died at Los Angeles, in California, where he was at that time French Consul. At the same meeting Mr. Dexter also presented a report in detail on the Holmes Papers, a collection of miscellaneous papers formerly in the possession of the Rev. Abiel Holmes, D.D., an officer of the Society for twenty years, and author of the "Annals of America."

In October he made a still more interesting communication, in submitting for publication the manuscript journals kept by Thomas Wallcut, at Marietta, in Ohio, in 1790, and by Charles Turner, Jr., in New Brunswick and Maine in 1802, with full editorial notes. His next important contribution was at the April meeting in 1880, when he offered some remarks on the alleged visits of the Northmen to the American continent, and presented an unpublished letter on this subject from Professor Erasmus Rask to Henry Wheaton, written just after the publication of Mr. Wheaton's "History of the Northmen."

About the time that this communication was made, Mr. Dexter wrote for the first volume of the "Memorial History of Boston" a short but admirably clear and well-considered chapter on "The Early European Voyagers in Massachusetts Bay." While thus actively engaged in the work for which this Society was founded, his health suddenly gave way; and on the 1st of October he tendered his resignation of the office of Recording Secretary, the duties of which he had discharged to the "great satisfaction" of the Society. "My health," he wrote, "has become uncertain, and my physician tells me that I cannot expect to go to Boston, or to attend to business of any kind for some months to come. As I cannot perform the duties of the office, I must necessarily resign it. I do so with regret; for I have appreciated the honor of the position, and enjoyed the pleasant duties of the office." In spite of the doubtful aspect for the future, and the uncertainty as to when, if ever, he would be able to take up his work again, the Society voted unanimously not to accept his resignation. A few weeks later he went abroad with his wife and one of

his children. The winter was spent in the south of France and in Italy. To the depression which naturally attaches to invalidism in a foreign land was now added the poignant grief of losing his youngest daughter, a fascinating child in her sixth year, who had been left at Cambridge with her maternal grandparents, and who died in January. He returned, however, in June, 1881, apparently much benefited by the change of climate.

At the close of the summer vacation he resumed his work in the Society with fresh zeal; and at the October meeting he submitted some very carefully prepared remarks on the first voyage under Sir Humphrey Gilbert's patent of 1578. Two months later he communicated copies of several letters of Governor Hutchinson in the Public Record Office in London, to which the attention of the Society had been called a short time before; and he also communicated for publication a manuscript record book of the Suffolk Bar, covering the period between 1770 and 1805, which he illustrated by an historical introduction and numerous notes. It was his hope that the task of editing this interesting volume would be undertaken by one of the legal members of the Society; but the gentleman to whom he looked for this service was then busy with other literary and professional work, and he accordingly assumed the labor himself, and performed it in a manner which left nothing to be regretted. In January, 1882, he presented a short and excellent memoir of the late Dr. Joseph Palmer. It had now become apparent, however, that he could not remain at home during the winter and spring; and a few weeks later, by the advice of his physician, he went to Aiken, S. C., where he remained until the early summer. This new exile from home and friends was no small trial to him, though he wrote to a friend, "I am well established here, and enjoying good weather and excellent health."

On his return he again resumed his seat at the Council table; and at the first meeting of the Society in the autumn he presented a number of letters written by Henry Wheaton during his first visit to Europe in 1805 and 1806. Among the plans which Mr. Dexter did not live to execute was the preparation of a memoir of Mr. Wheaton and a selection from his correspondence. At the same meeting at which this communication was made, he gave some extracts from a diary

kept in the spring and summer of 1775 by the Rev. Paul Litchfield, with introductory and explanatory remarks. In October he communicated the journal kept by the Rev. Dr. Belknap during a visit to the Oneida Indians in 1796, which he accompanied by an interesting introduction and valuable notes. This was his last contribution to our Proceedings, and nearly his last work for us. In December he was again obliged to leave home for his health, and went to Santa Barbara in California. "California agrees with me quite well," he wrote to a friend, in February; "and although Santa Barbara is not exactly the paradise pictured in the travellers' books and stories, it offers many attractions to a quiet man." While here he wrote to the Nominating Committee declining a re-election as Secretary; and at the Annual Meeting in 1883 his resignation was reluctantly accepted.

In the summer he came north, with the purpose of removing his family to Santa Barbara, and of making that place his home for several years, with the vain hope of restoration to health. On the last day before leaving Cambridge he came into Boston to the Dowse Library to bid good-by to the friends whom he was accustomed to meet there. His tone was cheerful and hopeful; but the overland journey to California and the voyage from San Francisco proved harder and more exhausting than he or any one had anticipated. He reached Santa Barbara greatly reduced in strength; and from that time he slowly and steadily declined. He breathed his last on the 18th of December, 1883. As was natural and fit, his mortal remains were brought back to the Cambridge which he loved well, and laid for their final rest at Mount Auburn.

The last literary work in which Mr. Dexter was engaged was a chapter on "Cortereal, Verrazano, Gomez, Thevet," for the forthcoming "Narrative and Critical History of America." The subject was a difficult one; and more than once he expressed to a friend his weariness of it, and his regret at having undertaken to deal with the perplexing questions involved in it. But there are no signs of this in his treatment of his subject. The narrative is clear and strong; and the critical part firm and well considered. He had studied his subject thoroughly; and he dealt with it in a calm and judicial manner. The work was so well and so thoroughly done that it scarcely needed the revision in the proofs which he did not live to give

it. In addition to the writings already enumerated, Mr. Dexter contributed short and excellent memoirs of Isaiah Thomas and of Simon Greenleaf to the Early Proceedings of the Society; and he rendered great service in the preparation of the Indexes to those volumes,—the copious Index to the first volume having been prepared wholly by him. He also prepared, as a labor of love, the Index to the second volume of the “Documentary History of Maine,” which Mr. Deane edited for the Maine Historical Society in 1877.

Mr. Dexter had great natural refinement, courteous manners, and a rare sweetness of temper; and in all his personal and official relations he was one of the most agreeable of men. The friends whom he once made were his friends always. No man was ever less moved by selfish motives. His opinions were never extreme, and were always expressed with candor and with perfect fairness toward those who differed with him. To the religious denomination in which he was brought up he was warmly attached, serving for some years as a vestryman and afterward as a warden of Christ Church, Cambridge, and as secretary and afterward as treasurer of the Episcopal Church Association in Boston and its neighborhood; but he was free from every form of narrowness and exclusiveness. He had the tastes of a scholar, which his ample means enabled him to cultivate freely; and his frequent visits to Europe made him familiar with several of the modern languages, and stored his mind with the best fruits of foreign travel. His habits were exact and methodical; and in pursuing his historical investigations his industry was untiring. As Chairman of the Committee for publishing the Proceedings of this Society, he went far beyond the requirements of his office, even verifying every important statement and every reference to printed authorities in the communications of other members. He was a polished writer and a judicious critic. In the work of the Historical Society he took especial pleasure; and it is not the exaggerated estimate of personal friendship, but a cool and balanced judgment which all his fellow-workers will confirm, when it is said, as it has been said often, that the Society has experienced no heavier loss in recent years than by the early death of the subject of this Memoir.